FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-174
Monday
11 September 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-174 CONTENTS *11 September 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

- Talks on Conventional Forces Resume in Vienna ... 1
  - Grinevskiy Comments on Issues *[Moscow Radio]* ... 1
  - Commentary Cites 'Optimistic Forecasts' *[Vedenyapin on Moscow Radio]* ... 1
- Bogachev Views Bush's Speech to American Legion *[TASS]* ... 2
- General Grinkevich Discusses Armed Forces Cuts *[TASS]* ... 2
- Program Views Defense 'Sufficiency' *[Surguchev on Moscow Radio]* ... 3
- Hungarian Proposal on Security Zone Viewed *[Vedenyapin on Moscow Radio]* ... 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- Perfilyev Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 8 Sep ... 5
  - Notes Lukyanov's Upcoming China Visit *[TASS]* ... 5
  - Discusses Chinese Delegation Visit *[TASS]* ... 5
  - Welcomes French Disarmament Stand *[TASS]* ... 5
  - Announces Akhromeyev To Visit Finland *[TASS]* ... 5
  - Hails African Consultations *[TASS]* ... 5
  - Condemns South African 'Terror Campaign' *[TASS]* ... 6
  - Announces Canberra CW Conference *[TASS]* ... 6
- Foreign Ministry Official Notes Antidrugs Drive *[TASS]* ... 6
- Soviet Delegation To Attend UN Drugs Conference *[AFP]* ... 7
- Text of Gorbachev Message to Culture Meeting *[PRAVDA 10 Sep]* ... 7
- Primakov, IPU Delegation Leave UK *[TASS]* ... 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- Quayle's Baltics Statement 'Flagrant Interference' *[Moscow Radio]* ... 8
- Quayle, Politicians' Need for Caution Noted *[Moscow Radio]* ... 8
- Glazunov Comments on Bush's Baltimore Speech *[Moscow International]* ... 8
- Yeltsin Cited on Visit to United States ... 8
  - Pre-Visit Interview Reported *[Moscow International]* ... 8
  - Further on Interview *[Moscow International]* ... 9
  - Arrival, Lecture Plans Reported *[Moscow Radio]* ... 10
  - Yeltsin on Plans for U.S. Visit *[IZVESTIYA 11 Sep]* ... 10
- Shevardnadze, Bessmertnykh, Meet With Matlock ... 11
  - Shevardnadze Receives Matlock *[TASS]* ... 11
  - Meting With Bessmertnykh 8 Sep *[TASS]* ... 11
- Medvedev Confers With USIA Director Gelb *[PRAVDA 6 Sep]* ... 11
  - Gelb on Purpose of Visit *[TASS]* ... 11
- 'Deceleration' Noted in U.S. Arms Dialogue *[Vasilyev in PRAVDA 9 Sep]* ... 12
- Army Daily Views U.S.-USSR Relations *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Sep]* ... 14

China

- Parliamentary Delegation To Visit China 12 Sep ... 15
  - Lukyanov To Head Delegation *[Moscow Radio]* ... 15
  - Lukyanov Grants Pre-Visit Interview *[Moscow International]* ... 15
- Spokesman on PRC Party Delegation Visit, Talks *[Moscow International]* ... 17
- Leningrad-Shanghai Joint Venture Successful *[Moscow International]* ... 18
- Soviet-Chinese Railway Construction Begins *[TASS]* ... 18

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Indonesian President Suharto Pays Official Visit 18
  Arrives in Moscow 11 Sep *[TASS]* 18
  Welcomed by Gorbachev in Kremlin *[TASS]* 18
  Arrives in Leningrad 9 Sep *[Moscow International]* 19
  Tours Samarkand Oblast 8 Sep *[Moscow TV]* 19
  Speaks at Samarkand Luncheon *[Moscow International]* 19
  Speaks With Uzbek Leader *[Moscow International]* 20
  Feted in Tashkent 7 Sep *[TASS]* 20
Business Cooperation Developed With Indonesia *[TASS]* 20

Near East & South Asia

Iaqi President's Personal Envoy Arrives 11 Sep *[TASS]* 20
Shevardnadze, Iraq's 'Aziz Praise Relations *[TASS]* 21
Afghan Minister Interviewed on 'Crucial Period' *[TASS]* 21

East Europe

Mazowiecki's Cabinet Nominees Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 9 Sep]* 21
  Cabinet Formation Continues *[TASS]* 22
Solidarity Judged 'Considerably More Seriously' *[Moscow Radio]* 23
GDR's Schabowski Discusses Socialist Achievements *[TASS]* 23
GDR Criticizes West German Refugee 'Campaign' *[TASS]* 23
Hungary Allows East German Refugees To Leave *[Moscow Radio]* 24
Hungarian Socialism, Role of Party Discussed *[Shishlin on Moscow TV]* 24
Achievements of Hungary's 'Roundtable' Noted *[IZVESTIYA 1 Sep]* 25
Yugoslav Defense Secretary Arrives in Moscow *[TASS]* 26

West Europe

Gorbachev To Visit Italy in November, Meet Pope *[Moscow TV]* 26
Gusev-Led Group Holds Economic Talks in Italy *[IZVESTIYA 8 Sep]* 26

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev Defends Perestroyka in 9 Sep Address *[Moscow TV]* 27
Politburo Faults Officials on Goods Shortage *[PRAVDA 10 Sep]* 29
Ligachev Calls for Party Unity in Frunze Speech *[IZVESTIYA 10 Sep]* 31
  Scores 'Ethnic Clashes' *[Moscow International]* 31
  Views Agro-Industrial Production *[PRAVDA 10 Sep]* 32
  Meets With Kirghiz Party Leader *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Yeltsin Plans 'Unofficial' U.S. Lecture Tour *[IZVESTIYA 9 Sep]* 33
Strike Situation in Azerbaijan Highlighted 33
  Strikers' Demands Outlined *[PRAVDA 10 Sep]* 33
  Petrochemical Situation 'Alarming' *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Sep]* 33
  Economy, Social Sphere Hit *[IZVESTIYA 10 Sep]* 34
  Railway Situation Viewed *[Baku Radio]* 34
  Baku General Strike Continues *[Moscow TV]* 34
  Baku Deputies Call for End to Strikes *[Baku Radio]* 35
  Baku Rally Held *[IZVESTIYA 11 Sep]* 35
  More on Baku Rally *[TASS]* 36
  People's Front Calls Off Strike *[AFP]* 36
Rally Held at Stepanakert's Victory Square *[Yerevan International]* 37
NKAO Council Appeals to UN Security Council *[Yerevan International]* 37
NKAO Council Cables Armenia on 'Tense Situation' *[Yerevan International]* 37
Armenia-Azerbaijan Transport Problems Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 37
Official Cited on Gasoline Shortage in Armenia *[Yerevan Radio]* 38

- Earthquakes Reported in Armenia, Buildings Damaged *[Baku Radio]* 38
- Lukyanov Speaks on Republics, Federation Renewal *[Moscow International* 39
- Alekseyev Cites Reaction to CPSU Baltics Statement *[TASS]* 39
  - Baltic Statement 'Justified' *[PRAVDA 9 Sep]* 40
  - Negative Reaction Criticized *[TASS]* 42
- Latvian 'Workers Union' Holds First Congress *[PRAVDA 10 Sep]* 43
  - Worker Dissatisfaction Expressed *[Moscow Radio]* 43
- Riga Party Chief Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 44
- Estonian Party Discusses Draft Action Program *[IZVESTIYA 9 Sep]* 46
  - Party Draft Program Released *[Moscow Radio]* 46
- Estonian Party Official on 'Nationalistic Tinge' *[TASS]* 46
- Commemoration of Abwehr's Estonian Arm Hit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Aug]* 47
- Lithuanians Reject Strike Call *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Sep]* 47
- Official Views Lithuanian Deputies Letter *[Moscow TV]* 48
- Brazauskas Discusses Hopes for Future *[PRAVDA 9 Sep]* 49
  - Outlines Lithuania's Objectives *[Vilnius International]* 51
- Lithuanian Deputy Criticizes Lizichev *[Vilnius International]* 51
- Sajudis Aide Remarks on Northern Territories Hit *[IZVESTIYA 7 Sep]* 53
- Declaration of Polish Autonomy Viewed *[Vilnius International]* 53
- Military Head Shuns Lithuanian Antidraft Leaflet *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Aug]* 54
- Lithuanian Science Priorities Noted *[TIESA 4 May]* 55
- Correction to 'Brazauskas on Postponement' 56
- Ukrainian People's Movement Congress Reported 56
  - Congress Opens 8 Sep *[Kiev International]* 56
  - Ukraine Party Chief Opposes Congress *[AFP]* 56
  - Interethnic Relations Discussed *[Kiev International]* 57
  - Speakers Urge 'Political Sovereignty' *[AFP]* 58
  - Congress Ends 10 Sep *[Kiev International]* 58
- Ukrainian Reactionary, Extremist Activity Hit *[IZVESTIYA 9 Sep]* 59
- Ukrainian Associate of Brezhnev Crticized *[PRAVDA 9 Sep]* 59
- Further Reportage on Moldavian Strike Situation 59
  - Strikes Over Language Law Continue *[Moscow TV]* 59
  - Moldavian Party Issues Appeal *[TASS]* 60
  - Supreme Soviet Commission Visits *[IZVESTIYA 9 Sep]* 61
  - More On Commission's Work *[PRAVDA 11 Sep]* 61
  - Kishinev Work Collectives End Strikes *[TASS]* 62
- Moldavian Supreme Soviet Session Begins 29 Aug *[TRUD 29 Aug]* 62
- Vorotnikov Interviewed on Russian Federation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Sep]* 64
- Tyumen Oilmen Urge Yeltsin To Save Pipeline *[IZVESTIYA 9 Sep]* 70
- Kaliningrad Obkom Elects New First Secretary *[Moscow TV]* 71
- PRAVDA Views Peasants' Role in Perestroyka *[5 Sep]* 71

Economic

- Maslyukov on 1990 Plan To Improve Social Sphere *[Moscow TV]* 72
- Gossnab Official Explains Gasoline Shortages *[IZVESTIYA 4 Sep]* 74

Agricultural

- Belousov Notes New State Agrochemical Association *[TASS]* 75
- Farm Experiment To Determine Future Grain Imports *[Moscow International]* 76
- Agricultural Developments for 7-9 Sep Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 76

Talks on Conventional Forces Resume in Vienna

Grinevskiy Comments on Issues

LD0809222189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 8 Sep 89

[Text] Talks on conventional forces in Europe [CFE] have resumed in Vienna. Following the first plenary session, our correspondent in Austria, Viktor Mikheyev, interviewed Ambassador Grinevskiy, leader of the USSR delegation at the talks. Among other things, he said:

[Begin Grinevskiy recording] The May initiatives put forward by Gorbachev on behalf of the states belonging to the Warsaw Pact and the rapid reply to them from President Bush have paved the way to a solution of the cardinal issues facing the conference. Here we now have the backbone—if one may use such an expression—of an agreement: This means the troops personnel, aircraft, helicopters, tanks, armored combat vehicles, and artillery. It also means equal levels and sublevels for these types of armaments, both on the scale of all of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals and for individual regions.

The task now is to coordinate and resolve a mass of technical questions. In other words, to work out and agree on a treaty. What's more, this is going to have to be done during an unprecedentedly short time for disarmament talks. NATO proposed between 6 and 12 months. We accepted this challenge. The Soviet Union and the countries of the Warsaw Pact will be ready to conclude such a treaty in 1990, although to be frank I'll say that it won't be easy to do so. The main thing here is a constructive approach by all participants. From this point of view the United States and the other NATO countries took an important step toward meeting the positions of the Warsaw Pact when they agreed to a reduction in their combat aircraft. But what's the relevance here of the antiaircraft defense air forces, which the United States has been stubbornly proposing should be included within the substance of the talks? According to the mandate, priority is given to reducing those armaments which could form a potential for surprise attack. Antiaircraft defense forces, as we know, do not possess such a potential.

Take another question—troop strength. Among other things, NATO proposes that only the troops of the United States and the USSR which are in Europe and outside the borders of their national territories should be reduced. But why should it be only the troops of these two states? Why, for example, should not the troops of Britain, France, Canada, Belgium, and the Netherlands which are on the territory of West Germany be reduced, too? There are more than 160,000 men belonging to them there—not a small number for such a small region as Central Europe. Under NATO norms this is 10 divisions.

Finally, there is the following problem which is also a vivid indicator of constructiveness. Despite ardent speeches at the Vienna talks in favor of winding up the arms race, in a number of NATO countries calls continue to be made for the creation of new armaments or for the modernization of existing ones, including tactical nuclear weapons. But these two lines of policy are irreconcileable with each other: One leads to disarmament in Europe, the other leads to a substantial raising of the level of military confrontation there.

If the United States and NATO are deliberately choosing the path of speedy understandings about substantial reductions in armaments, then plans for introducing new types of weapons for the troops could slow things down substantially. [end recording]

Commentary Cites 'Optimistic Forecasts'

LD0809150589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Talks have resumed in the Austrian capital on conventional armed forces in Europe. Diplomats and military experts from 23 Warsaw Pact and NATO states are again guests of Vienna's Hofburg Palace. Big hopes are pinned on the gathering for further progress in reducing troops and armaments on the continent. What are these optimistic forecasts based on? At the microphone is commentator Gennadiy Vedenyapin.

[Vedenyapin] Hopes of this kind are based primarily on the positive results of the two previous rounds of talks. They were held—and everyone agrees with this—in a really constructive spirit in a businesslike atmosphere. What did they show? Primarily—and this is the most important thing—a considerable degree of agreement emerged on many fundamental questions. The fundamental positions of the participating countries came closer together. The two conceptual approaches were clarified. Finally, the range of problems on which serious disagreement still, alas, persists, became more clear-cut.

For instance, there is a divergence of positions concerning the reduction of numbers of personnel of each of the military-political alliances. The fact is, the NATO countries exclude from the list of reductions the British, French, Canadian, Belgian, and Netherlands' troops, which are stationed outside their countries but within Europe.

Unresolved questions also persist regarding the reduction of the most destabilizing types of weapons: these are tanks, armored vehicles, artillery systems, and aviation facilities.

The current round does, in fact, envisage serious work on the further rapprochement of the sides' positions. What is the main task here? Obviously, on the basis of what has already been achieved, to try to reach specific agreements, to agree on and settle the mass of sometimes very tricky technical questions. In brief, it is a matter of working out and agreeing an overall treaty. And, moreover, this has to be done by schedules which are unprecedentedly early compared with other disarmament talks.

NATO, as we know, proposed that this should be achieved over 6-12 months. We accepted this challenge, and although we realize that it is not at all easy to do this, we will nevertheless be ready to conclude such a treaty even by next year.

The socialist countries see the next aim of the Vienna talks as being—already as a result of initial reduction—to come to equal collective levels of strength of troops and numbers of basic armaments for the states of NATO and the Warsaw Pact organization both in Europe as a whole and in individual European regions. Naturally, at the same time the new levels must be unconditionally and significantly lower than the levels which exist for any side at the present time. This would ensure a radical mutual reduction of troops, which we are aiming for, and would solve the problem of eliminating imbalances in conventional armaments.

In any case, we and our allies in the Warsaw Pact are carefully studying any initiatives, any reasonable initiatives coming from the participants in the Vienna talks, and we are conscientiously seeking opportunities for mutually acceptable solutions. The Soviet side—there is no doubt about this—will ensure the progress of the talks in the Austrian capital, which are called upon to become a turning stage in the development of the destinies of our continent.

Bogachev Views Bush's Speech to American Legion

LD0809142189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1300 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 8 Sep (TASS)—Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military affairs observer, writes:

U.S. President George Bush has reaffirmed his administration's adherence to "the policy of from a position of strength" and has called for further modernization of U.S. strategic nuclear forces.

Speaking at the congress of the American Legion in the city of Baltimore, the President declared that the best instrument for ensuring peace is U.S. military might and that modernization of strategic armaments, in his words, "will spur the Soviet Union to collaborate with us in reducing the threat of nuclear war."

Bush's speech in Baltimore was, in fact, the U.S. Administration's disheartening reply to the declaration, adopted in Belgrade, of 102 nonaligned states and national liberation movements, containing a call to the nuclear powers to "stop and turn back the arms race" with the final aim of "complete destruction of nuclear weapons".

As you can see, certain circles, ignoring the changes for the better in the climate of international relations which have taken place in the world in the past few years, continue to uphold the odious thesis "on reducing armaments by a U.S. preemptive build-up". From Bush's speech it follows that the USSR's decisions on unilateral reductions of its Armed Forces, as it were, were adopted only as a result of the build-up of U.S. nuclear might.

Washington's peculiar view of disarmament problems is emerging. Depending on the circumstances, the U.S. administration justifies the "need" for its military programs sometimes by the "growth of the Soviet Union's military might", and sometimes by unilateral reductions in the Soviet Armed Forces. The "logic" is this: in any event, in any circumstances, the United States must build up its nuclear and non-nuclear potentials!

It seems that the creation of new U.S. means of mass destruction is becoming an aim in itself in Washington, less and less connected with the problem of ensuring the security of the United States and with the military-political situation in the world.

Until the recent past, the Pentagon did not need to exert great effort in order to push through Congress its requests for war needs. Now, in the new conditions, the Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress have considerably cut the draft military budget for the 1990 fiscal year, including allocations for "Star Wars", nuclear submarines, new mobile ICBM's, and the B-2 bomber.

This development of events, evidently, was unexpected for the White House. In any case the U.S. administration was not able to react promptly enough to the changes in the situation in the world and could find nothing better than self-contradictory arguments in defense of the arms race.

General Grinkevich Discusses Armed Forces Cuts

LD0809123889 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—The West does not draw proper conclusions from the fact that the composition and structure of Soviet Armed Forces groups are acquiring, not just in word but in deed, a purely defensive nature due to unilateral cuts which the Soviet Union is carrying out as a good-will gesture, a Soviet colonel-general told TASS.

Dmitriy Grinkevich, chief of the Ground Forces General Staff, talked to TASS on the eve of the traditional Tank Troops' Day, marked in this country on September 10.

The general said that the elimination of 10,000 Soviet tanks is a well-founded and well-balanced move, which will not weaken the armed forces.

The strength of the armed forces "will remain at a level that would be sufficient for accomplishing tasks under our new defensive military doctrine," he said.

Grinkevich said that, apart from tanks, the reductions also cover forces and means capable of conducting and supporting offensive actions.

The general regretted the fact that the Western mass media continues speaking about a "Soviet military threat", whereas, he said, it was NATO that "does not rush to renounce offensive doctrines and concepts. NATO's Armed Forces continue real preparations for offensive actions."

He expressed hope that the Soviet measures will help many people in the West get rid of the "tank syndrome", imposed on them by Western propaganda.

"I hope that the talk about 'tank rams', purportedly contemplated by Soviet troops, will finally be abandoned."

Speaking about the Western stand in the third round of the Warsaw Treaty-NATO talks on conventional armaments in Europe, Grinkevich denounced NATO's attempts not to include 2,000 light tanks in the number of armoured vehicles to be reduced, under the pretext that they cannot be classified as "combat tanks".

"The defensive nature of our military doctrine is based on the premise that the Soviet Union will never, under any circumstances, attack anyone or be the first to start military actions or to use nuclear weapons," the general emphasised.

"Naturally, our tank forces will never be a means of aggression, either."

Program Views Defense 'Sufficiency'

LD0809184289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 8 Sep 89

[From the "International Situation: Questions and Answers" program, hosted by Igor Surguchev, All-Union radio political commentator, with KRASNAYA ZVEZDA observer (A.M. Golts), and "colleagues" Viktor Levin, Sergey Pravdin, and Kazbek Basiyev]

[Text] [Surguchev] We begin today's broadcast with a reply to Aleksey Mikhailovich Arishchev, an inhabitant of Tomsk, whose letter expresses in essence disagreement with the thesis of reasonable sufficiency in defense, which has now been adopted by the leadership of our country as the determining thesis in maintaining the USSR's defense capacity at the necessary level. Comrade Arischev writes that NATO continues to develop new weapons, and we cannot look on with indifference at their development. Therefore, we must improve our military equipment. So what reasonable sufficiency can there be, the listener from Tomsk asks, for of necessity, we have to catch up with the United States, he believes.

I ask (Aleksandr Matveyevich Golts) observer of the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspaper, to express his point of view on this issue. (Aleksandr Matveyevich) over to you.

[(Golts)] This letter is not unique. We receive similar ones at KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. In general, it is understandable why the writers of these letters express concern. All of their life experience indicates that the guarantee of the country's security lies in powerful armed forces, not only in possessing modern weapons, but in possessing them in the maximum possible quantities. It must be said that it was precisely from these positions that our country approached the construction of its armed forces.

Indeed, it was not us who initiated each of the spirals of the arms race, but we always strove to give a worthy response to the actions of the United States and NATO. We responded to the threat stemming from any particular weapons system by deploying a similar one, and if we could manage it, by deploying an even more powerful system. But the appearace of ever more destructive types of nuclear weapons led to the recognition by the mid 1980's that even the parity which had been achieved by great effort did not provide security. Each side possessed the capability of destroying the other dozens of times over. It became evident that nuclear war, in any of its forms, would mean universal ruin, and the only way back from the abyss was a decisive reduction in the mountains of accumulated weapons, and consequently a transfer of emphasis from military means of ensuring security to political measures—the holding of talks, the implementation of measures to increase trust, exchanges in all spheres, including the military sphere. No one can fail to see that this is producing definite gains.

As far as concerns the armed forces; from now on the construction of these is subordinated to the defensive military doctrine. One of the basic principles of this is reasonable sufficiency. Speaking in general terms this means that a state should have a military potential sufficient for a reliable defense, but excluding the possibliity of attacking another country or conducting major offensive actions. In this nuclear-missile age the attacker needs considerably greater forces and means than the defender.

From this it follows that reasonable sufficiency is by no means unilateral, thoughtless disarmament. In implementing this principle, the USSR is giving its Armed Forces a nonoffensive structure, reducing its strike weapons, lowering the parameters of the mobilization deployment. For example, we are removing from the composition of our troops groupings deployed in the zone of direct contact with NATO forces assault and assault crossing units, and reducing the number of tanks; on the other hand we are increasing the number of antitank and antiaircraft weapons. I would like to stress that all of these measures do not undermine our defense capacity. The decision to undertake them was adopted not only on the basis of the political situation, but also taking account of the nature of military confrontation and of the capabilities of each of the sides.

[Surguchev] (Aleksandr Matveyevich), is it possible to implement the principle of reasonable sufficiency when the United States and NATO are continuing to implement their military programs, as our listener writes.

[(Golts)] Reasonable sufficiency is not some sort of speculative formula requiring the mechanical reduction of a certain quantity of armed forces and armaments. The boundaries of the measures in the defense spheres are defined by the actions of the other side. As far as concerns specific U.S. military projects, what is necessary today is not to mirror them but to undertake assymetrical measures. Take, for example, the Star Wars program which has caused such a sensation. The USSR does not intend to create anything similar to the U.S. SDI. But in the event that such a system is deployed in the United States, the USSR will find the opportunity to counteract it, using much cheaper means.

[Surguchev] Yes. By the way, we spoke about this in some detail in one of our recent programs. But is the principle of reasonable sufficiency applicable in the sphere of nuclear weapons?

[(Golts)] In my opinion, nuclear weapons and reason are essentially incompatible. For mankind, only the total elimination of mass destruction weapons is what is essential and sufficient. However, one cannot fail to see that the doctrine of nuclear deterrent remains the alpha and omega of strategic planning in the West. But this does not mean that it is necessary to renounce reasonable sufficiency in defense. It is necessary to conduct talks in order step by step to eliminate the nuclear death. By the way, even in this extremely complicated issue there is room for bold decisions. An example of this is the INF Treaty. So, even today when the idea of reasonable defensive sufficiency is only just beginning to be implemented it is also working for security—our security and universal security.

Hungarian Proposal on Security Zone Viewed

LD1009001689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Text] The Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] has come forward with a new peace initiative. Specifically, it suggests that along its borders with Austria and Yugoslavia there should be created a security zone of increased trust and cooperation, with a width of up to 50 km. What, exactly, do they have in mind? What substance is contained in the concept of such a zone? Offensive weapons could be partially removed from it and it is envisaged that only border security organs should be left there, along with troops and equipment with a clearly expressed defensive character. My colleague, Genadiy Vedenyapin, an All-Union radio commentator, will aquaint you with the MSZMP's proposals in more detail.

[Vedenyapin] I will add that the Hungarian side is intending, as a first step along the path of strengthening good-neighborly relations with Yugoslavia and Austria, to reduce by 50 percent the number of its tanks in the zone along the state border of the three countries.

The MSZMP also proposes that the government cut expenditures on defense by 5.5 billion Florints, and also reduce the number of launchers for the delivery of nuclear warheads on the country's territory by half, to 14. In the zone indicated, apart from those measures provided for in the documents of the Stockholm Conference, it is proposed to undertake further measures to strengthen trust and security, for example, to limit the number and scale of exercises, to offer the possibility to receive systematic and sufficiently thorough information on the life of troops remaining in the zone.

The MSZMP initiative supplements and develops the whole series of peaceful political initiatives by the socialist states which are aimed at the consolidation of European security. It is not possible to list all of these, but I will try to remind you of the basic ones. We should, at least, take the memorable proposal of the GDR and Czechoslovakia to create in central Europe a non-nuclear corridor and a chemical weapon-free zone. The Jaruzelski Plan—that it how Poland's initiative has entered the international vocabulary—has as its goal the limitation of weapons and the strengthening of trust in this region. Finally, there is the Czechoslovak proposal to create along the line dividing the military blocs a zone of trust, cooperation, and good-neighborly relations. It is impossible not to mention the Warsaw Pact states' call to begin with the NATO countries immediate, separate talks on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, including the nuclear components of dual purpose means. It must be said that so far the call has not received a warm response from NATO headquarters, although the announcement by the Warsaw Pact countries on this question did not contain any concrete proposals, but only suggested starting a dialogue on the basis of the existing situation. A favorable political condition for such a dialogue, in the opinion of the socialist countries, would be the mutual rejection by both sides of modernization and of a quantitative increase of tactical nuclear weapons. As it happens, however, this does not suit the opponents of such talks, since they thought up the modernization of tactical nuclear weapons—in general, this has not been removed from the agenda once and for all—as a kind of compensation for the loss of the medium-and shorter-range missiles destroyed in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles. By modernizing the new generation of tactical weapons, Washington and London, in the first instance, would like to make up a bit, as it were, for what is being lost under the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles.

The list of peace initiatives, including the unilateral ones, of the socialist states could be continued, but we will finish on those I have listed already, for I think that is quite sufficient in order to judge on its merits the contribution being made by the comrades-in-arms of the Warsaw Pact to the process of strengthening European security, a process that now is gradually gaining a concrete outline in the course of the Vienna talks.

Perfilyev Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 8 Sep

Notes Lukyanov's Upcoming China Visit

LD0809135789 Moscow TASS in English 1347 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—A Supreme Soviet delegation led by first vice-president Anatoliy Lukyanov, who is also an alternate Politburo member, will pay an official visit to China on September 11-18 at the invitation of the Chinese National Assembly, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev announced at a briefing here today.

Lukyanov will hold talks with Chinese parliamentarians and a number of meetings with Chinese leaders. The delegation will also go on a tour of China.

Perfilyev said that it will be the second Soviet parliamentary visit to China after the resumption of contacts between the national legislatures of the two countries in 1985.

Discusses Chinese Delegation Visit

LD0809152189 Moscow TASS in English 1452 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—The working visit of a Chinese Communist Party Central Committee delegatuion to the USSR, which began on Thursday, will include talks at the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee's International Department, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a news briefing here today.

He said the talks will deal with practical issues of interparty contacts and other matters of mutual interest.

An understanding to restore interparty relations, severed in the 1960s, was reached during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to China last spring.

Recalling that understanding, Perfilyev said that both parties agreed that they would pursue contacts and exchanges in accordance with the principles of independence, complete equality, mutual respect, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

Welcomes French Disarmament Stand

LD0809170389 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—The Soviet Union welcomes France's desire to play a more active role, up to its international prestige, in the whole package of questions of disarmament, the solution of which is impossible without the participation of that country, Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, said at a briefing, held here today.

French Prime-Minister Michel Rocard's speech at the opening of the Higher National Defence Institute's session was taken notice of in Moscow, namely his phrase that the French military strategy, based on sufficiency and nuclear deterrence principles, should not be viewed as a self-isolation line. The deterrence strategy is compatible with disarmament, the prime-minister said.

Perfilyev recalled that at a session of the Council of Europe's Parliamentary Assembly in Strasburg Mikhail Gorbachev expressed considerations concerning a thorough discussion of the concrete content of the minimum deterrence concept by experts of the USSR, USA, Britain and France and also states which have nuclear weapons on their territory.

Vadim Perfilyev stressed however that at the same time certain statements by the French leaders raise questions. In particular, it is hardly possible to agree with the statement by Michel Rocard to the effect that a relaxation of Soviet-U.S. relations is fraught with the threat of regional instability. Moreover, as is borne out by life itself, the stabilization of the USSR-U.S. dialogue has in now way hindered but—on the contrary—has facilitated the quest for solutions to many regional problems.

Announces Akhromeyev To Visit Finland

LD0809150189 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—Soviet Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev will visit Finland from September 11 to 14 at the invitation of General Jaakko Valtanen, commander of that country's defence forces, first deputy chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Information Directorate Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

The program of the visit includes meetings between the Soviet military leader and Finnish President Mauno Koivisato, Prime Minister Harri Holkeri and Finnish military. [sentence as received] The Soviet Marshal will read a paper on the Soviet disarmament policy to the Paasikivi Society, whose members are prominent Finnish politicians and businessmen, to generals and officers of the Defence Force Headquarters and to members of the Central Board of the Finland-USSR Society.

Hails African Consultations

LD0809145189 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev hailed as useful and timely recent Soviet-African political consultations on issues included on the agenda of the forthcoming 44th session of the United Nations General Assembly.

The consultations, which took place early in September, involved the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Burundi and Ghana.

The discussions focussed on the issues of disarmament, the projected system of general security, and the political settlement of conflicts.

The consultations demonstrated the African nations' interest in the General Assembly debating the pressing problems of economic development in their continent as well as issues connected with the abolition of apartheid in South Africa, the granting of independence to Namibia, and an internal Angolan settlement, Perfilyev said.

He added: "The Soviet Union readily understands African states' concerns and desire to resolve African problems with the extensive participation of the world community.

"The positions of the USSR and these countries are either identical or close on many general international problems and on specific issues related to the political and economic situation in Africa."

Condemns South African 'Terror Campaign'

LD0809133389 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev today denounced the crackdown on anti-apartheid activists in South Africa during parliamentary elections on September 6.

"Pretoria's readiness and ability to effect fundamental changes and set the stage for dialogue will be judged in South Africa and throughout the world by its practical actions" rather than declarations, he told a briefing.

Perfilyev noted that the South African regime's latest terror campaign came just as the new leadership of the National Party made generous promises to abolish apartheid and steer the country out of the racist dead end.

The spokesman declared solid Soviet support for just demands by South African democratic forces for an immediate lifting of the state of emergency, the release of all political prisoners and the rescindment of a ban on democratic organisations as mandatory first steps in this direction.

Moscow believes it essential also to continue the international search for solutions in South Africa, including concerted extra international pressure on Pretoria.

Announces Canberra CW Conference

LD0809150989 Moscow TASS in English 1409 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—A conference of government and industrial representatives against chemical arms will be held in Canberra on September 18-22, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told reporters here today.

The Soviet delegations will include representatives of the Soviet Council of Ministers, Foreign Ministry, Defence Ministry and other agencies, and will be led by Nikita Smidovich, head of the Foreign Ministry department on arms control.

The main task of the conference is to help build up efforts to sign and ensure strict compliance with a convention to ban chemical arms.

The Soviet Union is hoping that the conference will make its contribution to an early ban on chemical arms and the elimination of chemical stockpiles on the basis of a global international convention subject to effective verification.

Foreign Ministry Official Notes Antidrugs Drive

LD0809140189 Moscow TASS in English 1343 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—The Soviet Union is prepared to step up its participation in concerted efforts to fight the illegal business in drugs on the basis of standards and principles of international law, a Soviet Foreign Ministry official told newsmen here today.

Yuriy Rybakov, head of the ministry's International Law Directorate, observed at a briefing that the task of preventing and curbing drug addiction has become extremely acute in the past years because the illegal trade in narcotics undermines the economy of several countries and poses a direct threat to the political situation in some of them, while bringing billions of dollars in profits for the criminal syndicates.

"It is perfectly obvious that the problem of fighting the drug trafficking, which is closely connected with other varieties of organised crime, including arms trade and terrorism, has grown into a political global problem that is impossible to resolve without broad international cooperation," he said.

The dimension of the problem prompts the need for a different assessment of actions in this field in the world arena, Rybakov said.

It is now important to complement multilateral cooperation with vigorous efforts aimed at establishing bilateral cooperation, he noted.

The Soviet Union recently concluded intergovernmental documents on cooperation and prompt interaction with Great Britain, the United States, France and West Germany, and is drafting similar agreements with other countries.

The ministry official admitted that the international community had not as yet dealt a decisive blow at the illegal business.

Soviet Delegation To Attend UN Drugs Conference

AU0909151089 Paris AFP in English 1415 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Text] Paris, Sept 9 (AFP)—The Soviet Union is to attend a United Nations conference to halt drug trafficking to open in Vienna on Monday, French Interior Minister Pierre Joxe said Saturday.

It is the first time Moscow is sending representatives to the conference, attended by police, customs and legal officials.

Colombian Justice Minister Monica de Greiff, whose country is waging an all-out war against the Medellin drug barons, is expected to be a key participant at the meeting, Mr. Joxe said in a statement.

Text of Gorbachev Message to Culture Meeting

PM1109100189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[M. Gorbachev undated message: "To the Participants in the International Meeting of Cultural Cooperation Foundations"]

[Text] I greet the participants in the international meeting of foundations assembled in Leningrad at the initiative of the Soviet and European Cultural Foundations. On the threshold of the 21st century, discussion of the problems of cultural cooperation is of enormous importance for the assertion of common human values.

The favorable influence of culture on the development of the individual and the humanization of international relations, and the recognition by mankind of its unity and interdependence are now greater than ever. Social organizations, various foundations, and citizens' associations are playing an increasing role in cultural cooperation and are helping the peoples to get to know and understand each other better.

I wish you success in your meeting and in all your noble work.
M. Gorbachev

Primakov, IPU Delegation Leave UK

LD1009145789 Moscow TASS in English 1324 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Text] London September 10 TASS—A delegation of the Soviet Parliamentary Group led by Academician Yevgeniy Primakov, chairman of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament), departed from London for Moscow today. It took part in the 82nd conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

United States & Canada

Quayle's Baltics Statement 'Flagrant Interference'

LD1009102889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Text] Foreign news agencies have reported on a speech by U.S. Vice President Quayle, in which he expressed United States support for the processes taking place in the republics of the Soviet Baltic. Quayle made it understood that in the event of intervention by Moscow in the affairs of these republics Washington will take corresponding measures. This statement by a highly placed representative of the administration is both in form and essence flagrant interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union.

Quayle, Politicians' Need for Caution Noted

LD1009135289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 10 Sep 89

[From "Mayak's" "Panorama" program presented by Ashot Nasibov]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech yesterday on Central Television, U.S. Vice President Dan Quayle's statement about U.S. support for the processes taking place in the Soviet Baltic republics, and some other matters are the main themes of foreign information agencies and programs of the American CNN television channel. Now to the details.

The REUTER agency describes the Soviet leader's speech as a simultaneous attack on the conservatives and those radicals who strive to block the reforms and to spread alarm. This speech is deemed a serious warning to those who strive to impede perestroyka. The calm and well-balanced character and tone of the Soviet leader's speech are noted. Yesterday U.S. Vice President Quayle stated that the United States supports, as he put it, the independence movement in the Baltic republics, and that possible interference by Moscow with the processes there might provoke an appropriate reaction from Washington. It is known that many emigrants from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia live in the United States, and their preoccupation with their relatives and compatriots is quite understandable. But, in my opinion, pronouncements of this sort at an official level might be seen as interference in our internal affairs, especially now when politicians so need to be cautious in any matter that concerns the interests of this or that nation, or this or that country.

Glazunov Comments on Bush's Baltimore Speech

LD0809133889 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] The United States' President, George Bush, has spoken in Baltimore at a convention of the American Legion, an association of retired servicemen. Our observer, Viktor Glazunov, comments on this occasion:

[Glazunov—in Russian, fading into English translation] The audience can influence the speaker—the American Legion is certainly a special kind of audience thinking in categories of force. So when politicians address them their speeches are always stamped by account of force. President Bush's address in Baltimore was no exception. But was it all a tribute to the audience? Not so, I'm afraid. President Bush spoke of a paramount need to rid America of a fear of war. He named the military might of America as the best way to do it. But isn't it a new version of the old fatal formula: If you want peace prepare for war. Military might is needed for victories in wars.

In that respect the President was right referring to the experience of World War II. But to prevent a new war, as most people agree nowadays, including the President himself, we need reciprocal disarmament. To achieve that reciprocal disarmament President Bush insists that his country should step up its military might and carry out a program of modernizing strategic arms. But what if the other side does the same? What will be the result? A new fiery spiral of the arms race; nothing else. But why step up strategic arms in the Soviet Union and the United States if we are conducting talks on halving them? President Bush asserts that that would help bring pressure on the Soviet Union. But why is any pressure needed? The Soviet Union is ready to sign a treaty on strategic arms reductions at any time. What is in the way? It is the position of Washington on the ABM Treaty and on sea- and air- based cruise missiles. As soon as the American side yields on that the way will be cleared for halving strategic arms. Instead of that, new obstacles are being piled up such as Trident and Minutemen missiles and Stealth strategic bombers. President Bush called in Baltimore for modernizing American strategic forces to achieve arms control. That is to say: Let's arm ourselves in order to disarm—like pouring oil on fire. That is clear to many congressmen who wrote against new allocations for new strategic arms systems. President Bush's address in Baltimore gives one cause to think where is Washington heading? For disarmament or rearmament?

Yeltsin Cited on Visit to United States

Pre-Visit Interview Reported

LD0809132989 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Report on interview with Boris Yeltsin, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and of the CPSU Central Committee, by Sergey Goryachev; date, place not given—passages within quotation marks are Yeltsin's remarks recorded in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, a member of the Soviet parliament and of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, flies on Saturday [9 September] to the United States for 1 week. He has said in an interview to Sergey Goryachev of our staff that he was looking forward to seeing America and Americans. This will be the first visit to the United States for Boris Yeltsin. Earlier this year he received an invitation from the Rockefeller Foundation, from the Ford Foundation, from Senators Pell and Bradley, as well as from several U.S. universities. How does he regard America on the eve of his visit? Boris Yeltsin:

"I now picture America to myself not as I did before: a stagnating country that was falling apart. This is a sufficiently healthy country to my mind with a long experience of bourgeoise democracy, economically strong, and with interesting people. As I see it, the people there are frank and open-minded. Of course, they too have their problems and that is interesting to me."

Boris Yeltsin has rejected an earlier report that he was going to deliver a course of lectures in the United States about perestroyka in the USSR and donate the fees to the national fund for combat against AIDS. He said his trip is not meant for earning fees but will be business-like:

"This will be a business trip with a crammed program. I put several aims to myself. First, to get an idea of the country, to meet a large number of political leaders, business community, and intellectuals. As the chairman of the Soviet parliament's commission on construction and architecture I am naturally interested in the U.S. building industry. I believe we must learn from the United States in this area. We could also borrow from the country's 200 years experience of parliamentary activity. What suits our conditions should be borrowed as soon as possible. I may have a meeting with the President if he wishes to receive me."

Boris Yeltsin is going to the United States for 1 week, though he wanted to stay there longer because, as he said, he has to take part in the coming full-scale meeting of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee on ethnic relations. He will visit New York, Washington, San Francisco, Chicago, and Philadelphia. Fifty-eight-year-old Boris Yeltsin is second in popularity in the Soviet Union only to Mikhail Gorbachev, according to Soviet public opinion polls.

Does he view his trip to the United States as that of a member of parliament, or as something greater? He says:

"Americans apparently regard me as one of those men who, as they see it, is sort of part of an opposition, or left-winger. They may wish to examine me, to try to tell me that the American way of life is a better one. I regard my trip as something greater than simply that of a member of parliament."

Further on Interview

LD0909112189 Moscow World Service in English 0310 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Report on interview with Boris Yeltsin, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and CPSU Central Committee, by Sergey Goryachev; date, place not given—passages within quotation marks are Yeltsin's remarks recorded in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, a member of the Supreme Soviet and the Communist Party Central Committee, starts a week-long visit to the United States on Saturday. In an interview with Sergey Goryachev of our staff, he said he was going to visit New York, Washington, San Francisco, Chicago, and Philadelphia. Boris Yeltsin has shortened his trip to 1 week to come back in time, as he explained, for the upcoming full-scale session of the Comunist Party's Central Committee on interethnic relations. These relations have come to the fore following a wave of strikes in the Baltic republics and Moldavia and other regions and demands for greater economic and political independence. Some people in this country blame the tension on the reform process, perestroyka. However, Boris Yeltsin disagrees with such assertions.

"I do not dramatize the situation. Of course, in the wake of democratization in society, the chance to express their will more freely, the openness people are becoming more politically minded, are taking a civic stand and displaying dignity. And this dignity was infringed upon, nor was the sovereignty of the republics observed. We believe that the problem of interethnic relations had been solved in the country long ago. This has now led to tension, but the tension would have flared up sooner or later anyhow, regardless of perestroyka."

Ways of developing the Soviet federation are to be at the focus of the full-scale meeting of the Communist Party's Central Committee later this month. In Boris Yeltsin's view the disturbances will end if the course towards a greater independence of the republics, charted by the Supreme Soviet, is put into practice.

"I believe people will calm down once economic and political independence has been granted not only to the republics that make up the Union but also to smaller entities, the autonomous republics. Many seats of tension have emerged in the autonomous republics, but to make them really independent it's necessary to amend the Constitution. The speedy drafting and adoption of a new constitution was one of the political demands of the miners during their recent strike, and we'll have to go through this."

As one of the country's legislators, Boris Yeltsin intends to familiarize himself with parliamentary practices in the United States. In five cities he is to meet with politicians, businessmen, and intellectuals. He does not rule out the possibility of meeting with President Bush if the President should want to meet him. It can be expected that the Americans Boris Yeltsin will talk to will be interested in his views on the state of the Soviet economy. He believes the economic problems were aggravated by the erroneous laws adopted in the course of perestroyka.

"For one thing there is the law on the state enterprise which, instead of giving the enterprises leaway, in fact constrain them. There is also the problem of cooperatives. We just can't seem to come to a decision that would make everyone happy—the cooperatives themselves, the population, and the government—and now the population is resentful, and this is particularly dangerous."

Lately there's been a shortage of even goods that used to be plentiful in this country. In this connection some of the news media have been expressing the fear that since the people are concerned about the worsening standard of living they might support another leader who promises them to correct the situation quickly by using a firm hand, but that would mean a dictatorship. Boris Yeltsin believes there is no danger of a dictatorship in the country.

"I think perestroyka has now clearly advanced from a revolution from the top to a revolution from below. I believe that the people would no longer allow an iron fist to come to power. What is needed is to oust the bureaucratic apparatus, which is now the main obstacle to perestroyka. The people were ousted by elections, but it also has to be ousted at the top echelons, very top included. For this the party has to hold a special congress as quickly as possible. That would be beneficial to Mikhail Gorbachev. The congress could discuss drastic changes in the party since there have been none so far. The Central Committee, which is today conservative, could be reelected and the Political Bureau renewed."

Boris Yeltsin censured Mikhail Gorbachev for the fact that the revolution he started from the top had ceased to be an impulse for the people. He said the Soviet leadership had lost the initiative in perestroyka.

"During the first 2-3 years they did something, but then they, Mikhail Gorbachev included, would not heed the advice to change the perestroyka tactics. No, they persisted their line on a wide front and, though with the bureaucratic apparatus and the conservatives applying the brakes, this line began to peter out. The outcome of the Congress of People's Deputies and of the first session of the Supreme Soviet, this country's parliament, dissatisfied the people. In fact, it was right after this that the strike movement got underway in the country. The people have expected more, but Mikhail Gorbachev is an advocate of constant compromise, and one can't win in politics by constant compromises."

It now looks as if it's hard to gain political popularity in the Soviet Union by criticizing the party apparatus and government bureaucracy. This can be achieved easily by criticizing Mikhail Gorbachev, but as an earnest reformer he cannot afford to take sides in the current situation. For Boris Yeltsin it is possibly easier to win popularity by promises, but Mikhail Gorbachev deals with real problems. Boris Yeltsin's view:

"Least of all do I criticize Gorbachev for the sake of criticism. I have supported him all along. I have always said that from the point of view of the strategic line in perestroyka our views coincide. As far as tactics are concerned, we do differ, but this fits into the framework of pluralism."

As the leader of what has come to be known as the Interregional Group of deputies, which united the most radically minded legislators, Boris Yeltsin has asked it to draft alternative bills. He has said the group is now drafting legislation on the press, the state enterprise, property, and pensions. The draft will be submitted for debate at the next session of the Supreme Soviet later this year.

Arrival, Lecture Plans Reported

LD1009140889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Text] Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has arrived in New York. REUTER reports that he will meet with business people, politicians, and economists. Yeltsin is to visit a number of U.S. cities and deliver lectures. It is curious that for each lecture he will be paid $25,000. According to his statement, he will hand this money over to the scientific research foundation to combat AIDS in the USSR.

Yeltsin on Plans for U.S. Visit

PM1009184989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Correspondent A. Shalnev dispatch and reprint of REUTER report under general headline: "B.N. Yeltsin's Trip to United States"]

[Text] New York—B.N. Yeltsin arrived in New York 9 September. Quite by chance your correspondent was on the same aircraft. According to Yeltsin, he will spend 1 week in America, during which he plans to visit Los Angeles, San Francisco, Dallas, Chicago, and Washington in addition to New York.

The USSR people's deputy is convinced that it is time to transfer Soviet-U.S. economic cooperation to a qualitatively new basis. "It is time," he said, "to make the transition from granting credits, deliveries of equipment, and so forth to direct U.S. investment in the Soviet economy."

One of the deputy's other ideas is to involve U.S. business in developing and improving the services sphere in the USSR, particularly in "its sore points"—the mining regions, for example, in the Kuzbass and the Donbass, as well as in Moscow and Leningrad.

During the trip B.N. Yeltsin will visit a number of major U.S. universities. "To give lectures?" "No, to have meetings," was the reply.

He also said that he has already completed a rough draft of a book, which he might, for the time being, call "Problems, Thoughts, Actions, the Future."

REUTER reports:

Soviet Communist Party radical Boris Yeltsin arrived in New York Saturday, voicing a desire to meet with U.S. President George Bush and also to observe how U.S. democracy works.

"America has more than 200 years of experience of democratic rule, although it is a bourgeois democracy," Yeltsin told journalists through an interpreter. "We are only taking the first steps in this regard."

"We have to learn from the United States how to live and work," he said.

Yeltsin, who received more votes than any other delegate to the Congress of People's Deputies during the first open elections in the Soviet Union for 70 years, held in March, declared that he would be pleased to meet with the U.S. leader, "if President Bush expresses a desire to receive me."

The 58-year-old politician will receive $25,000 for each of the appearances planned for him in the United States. He intends to donate this money to research into the fight against AIDS in the Soviet Union.

Shevardnadze, Bessmertnykh, Meet With Matlock

Shevardnadze Receives Matlock

LD1109112689 Moscow TASS in English 1121 GMT 11 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 11 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today received Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request. They discussed some issues connected with the forthcoming meeting of the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state in the United States.

Meting With Bessmertnykh 8 Sep

LD0809175189 Moscow TASS in English 1608 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh today received the U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union, Jack Matlock, at his request.

They discussed issues connected with the forthcoming Soviet-American meeting at foreign ministers' level.

Medvedev Confers With USIA Director Gelb

PM1109103189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Talks Held"]

[Text] On 5 September V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received USIA Director B. Gelb, who is in Moscow in connection with the opening of the "U.S. Design" exhibition.

The state of information and cultural exchanges between the USSR and the United States was discussed during the talks and mutual satisfaction with their successful development was expressed.

At the request of his interlocutor V.A. Medvedev spoke about the progress of Soviet society's perestroyka. It was emphasized that the profound reforms of the political and economic system being implemented in the USSR are based on a humanistic vision of socialism, and the interests of man and the development of his creative abilities are their aim.

We understand and welcome the interest being shown abroad in Soviet perestroyka. Our perestroyka cannot pose any threat to the West. At the same time the hopes that perestroyka marks our society's evolution in the direction of capitalism are also illusory. On the contrary, it means the fuller revelation of socialism's potential. It is naive to reckon on using certain present difficulties to pressure the Soviet Union. Only mutual respect and recognition of the diversity and variety of the modern world can serve as a sound basis for equitable cooperation.

The U.S. side emphasized the U.S. interest in the success of the reforms being implemented in the Soviet Union. The United States rates highly the processes of democratization and glasnost in the USSR, which unleash people's initiative and broaden their decisionmaking rights. In the guests' opinion, although there are forces in the United States which are prejudiced against perestroyka, they are few and their influence on the shaping of U.S. policy is limited.

The U.S. interlocutors also declared that the United States is ready for a broad exchange of information and people both in the sphere of education, science, and culture and in the economic sphere. It could share its existing experience of resolving economic and technological problems and promote with practical deeds the success of the Soviet reforms in the spheres of agriculture, trade, and consumer goods production. But for this it is necessary more decisively to overcome the bureaucratic obstacles that exist both in the United States and in the USSR.

The Soviet side voiced agreement with the said intentions and emphasized that the USSR is in favor of expanding mutually advantageous contacts and exchanges with the United States in all spheres, including the economy, where progress is less noticeable in comparison with other spheres. Such exchanges help to strengthen trust between the two countries' peoples and serve the cause of peace and international security.

Participating in the talks were A.Ya. Degtyarev, first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department; V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister; and J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR.

Gelb on Purpose of Visit

LD0909200489 Moscow TASS in English 1922 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 9 TASS—Director of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) Bruce Gelb gave an interview to TASS several hours before taking a plane for home. He told TASS that the purpose of conversations with Soviet representatives was "to improve understanding between your country, the Soviet Union, and the United States". The USIA director was staying in the USSR in connection with the opening in Moscow of the exhibition "Design U.S.A."

Gelb said that over many years he had been following with much interest the processes in the Soviet Union. He said that he visited the USSR as a businessman twice, in 1959 and 1960, and can say that nothing can replace direct contacts with people, such as he had with Vadim Medvedev, with other officials responsible for the mass media, cultural exchanges, education. He said "all of them are taking the same basic position which is an honest position: 'We in the Soviet Union have real problems, we are looking at how to solve these specific problems". [quotation marks as received] He said this bespeaks of the recognition of problems and "the unwillingness to paper them over or to sweep them under the rug".

Gelb is of the opinion that his meetings with Soviet representatives promoted the strengthening of confidence between the USSR and the USA. He said it is important to continue "the wonderful process that we have been watching for the last few years, certainly since glasnost has started to work within your country".

Asked what he expects from the forthcoming meeting between James Baker and Eduard Shevardnadze, the USIA director answered: "Only good things. Good and frank discussions. The whole world is very optimistic about these talks".

'Deceleration' Noted in U.S. Arms Dialogue

PM1009153789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[Political observer Gennadiy Vasilyev article: "Why They Are Applying the Brakes. Soviet-U.S. Relations and Arms Limitation Talks"]

[Text] You might think we have no time for "foreign" concerns now. Serious domestic concerns—the economy, national relations, and reinterpretation of the country's past and present—have come to the fore in social life. And yet foreign affairs do not elude readers' attention. Including questions of Soviet-U.S. relations and, primarily, their disarmament aspect. The editorial office receives many letters whose writers welcome the USSR's peace-loving initiatives and the unilateral reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces and arms. At the same time they ask this question: Will this not lead to a weakening of the country's defense capability, and are we not jeopardizing our national security?

Readers quite rightly recall that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries demonstrate their peaceful aspirations in practice by advancing a whole package of new initiatives. We are carrying out large-scale reductions of armed forces in Europe (500,000 men, 10,000 tanks, 8,500 artillery systems, 800 combat aircraft) and cutting our defense spending (by almost R30 billion with regard to the approved 5-Year Plan). In accordance with the defensive nature of the Warsaw Pact doctrine, our allies are also substantially reducing their armed forces, making structural changes to them, and cutting military spending. Two months ago the conference of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee advanced a broad program of specific measures aimed at eliminating the threat of war and strengthening international security. They reaffirmed their readiness to seek with all interested countries accords leading to the phased reduction and subsequent total elimination of nuclear arms, to the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, to the radical reduction of conventional arms, to the prevention of the spread of the arms race into space, to the gradual curtailment of military production, and to a substantial reduction in military spending.

Indeed, are we not going too far? Are we not displaying "dangerous starry-eyed idealism"? I think not, that even after these measures, which are being implemented and planned, our country's security will be reliably ensured. For it is not a matter simply of the figures characterizing the might of the two military-political alliances. For a long time we adhered in our defense building to the principle of "mirror reflection." We endeavored to respond to a new Western missile with another missile of our own, and to a tank with two tanks. The so familiar "gross output" approach was manifested and was no less burdensome and inefficient than in the peaceful sectors of industry. Now the USSR Armed Forces, like the whole country, are going through a period of perestroyka. We are switching from the principle of superarmament to the principle of reasonable and reliable sufficiency for defense. The dimensions, structure, and nature of arms and, of course, the military doctrine itself are being brought into line with the realities of the time, with the trends of international life, and with the new political thinking. No less than the USSR's unilateral arms reduction initiatives, these fundamental changes, show the Soviet Union's aim of resolving international problems by political means and seeking sensible compromises—without which mankind's survival in the nuclear missile age is unthinkable.

With their unilateral reductions the socialist countries are giving the West a head start, as it were, encouraging it to take countersteps. And here I cannot disagree with the critical mood of many readers' letters: There is no way you can call the reaction of the United States and other NATO countries adequate. On learning of the Soviet Union's new initiatives, people on the other side of the ocean now praise us. Bravo, they say, continue in the same spirit! At the same time they add that the Soviet Union has superiority in the spheres where we are voluntarily reducing our armed forces. And yet the war machines of the two countries and the two blocs are known to be asymmetrical. If you were to follow this logic, why should not the United States and NATO cut the surpluses where they have them? In tactical strike aircraft, for example, in the numbers of naval personnel in the seas and oceans adjacent to Europe, in large surface ships, and in ships with cruise missiles.

In order to correctly assess our defense building it is not enough simply to compare numerical data and to analyze the troops' tactical and technical readiness. It is necessary to see the world situation as a whole. Substantial changes for the better have occurred recently in international affairs under the influence of perestroyka in our country. This is clearly manifested in the sentiments of the public in Western countries, which advocates broader East-West cooperation and reduced military spending, and in the initiation of dialogue between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, the first small step on the long road to a nuclear-free world, is being fulfilled successfully. The two countries have resumed talks on the next, still more important agreement—a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms. As a result of the major initiatives of the Soviet Union and our Warsaw Pact allies, which have given rise to NATO counterproposals, opportunities have been opened up for rapid progress at the Vienna talks on conventional arms and armed forces in Europe. Good prospects have recently become apparent for concluding an agreement on prohibiting chemical weapons.

Yes, there have been changes. It has been possible to make progress in international affairs, lower tension and confrontation, increase confidence, and develop political dialogue. And yet the picture is contradictory. Favorable processes have not yet become irreversible. The stereotypes born during the "cold war" years are being overcome with difficulty. The strategy of nuclear deterrence reaffirmed at the NATO jubilee session remains a dangerous anachronism. There are aspects in the U.S. Administration's activity and also in the conduct of the U.S. delegations at the disarmament talks that cannot fail to arouse concern. Take, for example, the talks on nuclear and space arms. Their latest, 11th round ended recently. It took place after a 7-month break occasioned by the change of administration in Washington. It cannot be said that this round produced no results—certain formulas were agreed on, and certain details were elaborated. But, on the whole, progress toward the goal of completing the drafting of a very important agreement was plainly held up. The Americans are stubborn in their desire to deploy ABM defenses (the SDI program)—which would mean violating the 1972 ABM Treaty. Nor do they wish to limit sea-launched cruise missiles. All this cannot fail to create alarm concerning the prospects for an end accord whose attainment seemed directly visible during the last months of the Reagan administration.

Or let us take a report just in. Energy Secretary J. Watkins has announced that the United States will soon resume production of tritium for nuclear warheads, which was suspended a year ago. I will remind you that the USSR has already decided to cease production of highly enriched uranium for military purposes this year, intends to curtail production of weapons-grade plutonium, and has proposed to the Americans that we begin drawing up a bilateral agreement on the controlled cessation of the production of all fissionable materials for weapons. Washington's new step can only be viewed as unconstructive.

These and other facts make you wonder what is behind the U.S. Administration's actions, which, it seems to me, has recently "applied the brakes" to the disarmament process. The new people in Washington took more than 6 months to carry out their "strategic review." The Soviet side accepted this with patience and understanding. We took into consideration Washington's explanations that the "Bush team" needed to suspend the talks that had been developing successfully in order to make a detailed analysis of the U.S. strategic positions. We were awaiting renewed approaches and fresh views. And, of course, we hoped that all this would benefit the cause and further accelerate the constructive Soviet-U.S. dialogue. But, alas, so far there has been deceleration instead of acceleration. And again there is a question which is still hard to answer: What is this—an ongoing slow start or a policy of dragging out talks?

It is no secret that there are many people on the banks of the Potomac who dislike the new trends in the world. Almost every day news agencies report statements by one politician or military figure or another, urging Washington "not to weaken" in its attitude toward the USSR, not to hasten to meet the socialist countries, and not to abandon the programs that have been started or outlined for modernizing and building up strategic arms. It has become customary for representatives of the country's extreme right-wing circles to make such appeals. But they frequently stem also from deep within the U.S. Administration itself, which enjoys a reputation of being centrist-conservative in terms of the thrust of its views and professional and businesslike by nature.

Take U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney, for example. Having set himself the goal of pushing the Pentagon's military program through Congress at all costs, he is being particularly active in endeavoring to sow suspicions with regard to the Soviet Union's peace initiatives. Cheney speaks with malicious irony of those members of Congress who seek to reduce military spending: "They have seen certain changes and obviously believe that everything is fine now.... This is like taking off your winter coat on the very first sunny day in January." Well, according to Mr Cheney's line, maybe they should put on their fur coats right now, in September, and turn the freezers full on?

The desire "to apply the brakes" to the movement toward a nonviolent, nuclear-free world is criticized quite widely in the West, including in the United States itself. I will cite recent statements by such well-known people as R. McNamara, former U.S. defense secretary and former president of the World Bank; W. Colby, former director of the CIA; and D. Rouch [name as transliterated], Canada's representative on the UN Disarmament Commission. These people believe that a policy based on the philosophy of the new thinking initiated by M.S. Gorbachev opens up before the people unique opportunities for curbing the arms race, strengthening international security, and pooling mankind's efforts to resolve global problems. They accuse the leaders of the United States and other NATO countries of a tunnel vision of the world, excessive caution, and a lack of imagination. They argue that the West must get a move on, not merely take the Warsaw Pact countries' unilateral initiatives for granted, and not reckon to succeed in "squeezing" more out of the socialist countries by acting from a "position of strength."

I believe that our readers will agree with this formulation of the question.

Recent reports from Washington appear to induce optimism. It is reported that, on returning to the capital after his vacation, President G. Bush brought with him plans for "more intensive" cooperation with the Soviet Union, and that he would like to clear away "some of the obstacles" and accelerate the talks on strategic offensive arms.

I would like to believe that serious, mature decisions lie behind these words.

Army Daily Views U.S.-USSR Relations

LD1109111989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Sep 89 First Edition p 3

[Manki Ponomarev article in response to reader's letter: "Dual Approach Noted By Everyone"—first two paragraphs are editorial introduction and reader's letter]

[Text] Our reader L. Talankina of Leningrad has written to the editorial office. She writes, in particular:

"I am usually interested to read international observers' answers to readers' questions in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (it has long been my favorite newspaper). As a rule, the replies cover the most acute issues of the day, help us to understand them, and profoundly clarify the cause and effect of world events. After some hesitation I have decided to ask my own questions, because I am very concerned about the policy of the new U.S. President G. Bush. Where is he headed? Why has he still not met with M.S. Gorbachev? How dangerous are the military plans under development by the White House and the Pentagon? Please answer, if possible."

The questions you raise in your letter, esteemed Lidiya Stepanovna, are very important and complex. I simply do not have room to answer them in detail. And there is probably no need—both our newspaper and other Soviet mass media organs are constantly covering them. That is why I will merely try to point out the most substantive and important points so as to make it easier for you and other readers to get an impression of the overall picture.

You are aware that although more than 7 months have passed since G. Bush became U.S. President, the political course which he intends to follow has not yet been finally determined. Yes, Bush has repeatedly talked about the continuity of his policy and the fact that he will move in the same direction on the international scene as his predecessor R. Reagan. And, to a certain extent, that is what he is doing. At any rate, there have been no abrupt about-faces. But Bush's emphasis is new in a number of cases, and this is becoming more and more noticeable.

Take such a highly important issue as disarmament. In the latter years of his presidency, particularly after the conclusion of the treaty with the Soviet Union on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, R. Reagan devoted particular attention to talks with the USSR on halving both countries' strategic offensive weapons. And, although he did not want to make any concessions over his beloved "Star Wars" program, there was tangible progress at the talks.

The picture is somewhat different now. The G. Bush administration, judging by everything, has shifted the stress from the problem of strategic offensive weapons reduction to the problem of armed forces and conventional arms reduction in Europe, and has even given an unprecedentedly positive reply to the Soviet initiatives in this sphere. Of course, such a step can only be welcomed. But the talks on nuclear and space arms, seemingly pushed into the background, have essentially ground to a halt and there has been virtually no progress at them owing to the U.S. side's position.

With regard to disarmament issues—which are vitally important not only for the United States and the USSR, but for all mankind, too—the dual approach and contradictory nature of the current White House political course is clearly visible. As yet it is hard to say quite definitely what is causing it. Possibly it is a lack of unity and agreement within the administration itself—it is well known, for instance, that Defense Secretary R. Cheney often adopts much harder-line positions than other cabinet members such as Secretary of State J. Baker. Possibly it is fear of a sharp reaction from the extreme right, the most reactionary circles in U.S. society. Or perhaps—this is the NEW YORK TIMES view, at any rate—it is a certain loss by the leaders of the administration of their intended role of elaborating foreign policy. But, whatever it is, this dual approach and contradictory nature has been noticed by all serious observers.

Obviously, Lidiya Stepanovna, this is the answer to your question about Soviet-U.S. relations. On the one hand, the U.S. President seemingly advocates support for perestroyka in the USSR and welcomes glasnost and the democratization of social life. But on the other hand, he indulges in certain steps which cast doubt on his sincerity and display arrogance toward us and the processes taking place in our country. And he is doing nothing substantive to continue the improvement in relations between our countries begun under his predecessor or to develop Soviet-U.S. cooperation that would be fruitful for both sides.

The importance of summit meetings in this respect is well known. There were five such summits between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in the space of 3 and ½ years. But G. Bush is in no hurry. At the start of his presidency one could read speculation in the press that another Soviet-U.S. summit would be held somewhere around August or September. But we are now already into September and there has still been nothing specific on this score. It has merely been reported that the preconditions—still just preconditions as yet—for a new stage in the summit dialogue should be worked out at the meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker to be held in the United States 22-23 September. Even the U.S. press is expressing dissatisfaction about these delays. "In Gorbachev Bush has a partner willing and able to visualize the road to agreement," THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote, for instance. "He has no right to waste this opportunity."

Of course, such a meeting is necessary. But, needless to say, there should be thorough preparations for it. We do not need to be hasty in this area. Nor, however, do we need delays. After all, a great deal in Soviet-U.S. relations has still not been settled, a great deal in U.S. policy generates fears.

Most often these fears are linked to the scale of U.S. militarist preparations and its gigantic spending on developing state-of-the-art weapons and on other military purposes. I will say bluntly that there are weighty grounds for these fears. Indeed, the President has asked Congress for more than $300 (three hundred!) billion to pay for Pentagon spending in the next fiscal year. This huge sum is simply inconceivable.

Does all this pose a threat to us? Undoubtedly it does. We have every reason to state that the threat of war has receded over the past few years. But it has only receded, it has not yet been eliminated. And that is why the Soviet Union has to pay attention to its defense. We are now basing our defense on the principle of reasonable sufficiency. But what does "reasonable" mean? Something that makes defense reliable. And the level of sufficiency is set not even and not so much by us as by the other side. So we have to really take their actions into account.

Nonetheless, we realize that both the United States and its allies are now hardly likely to take the crazy step of starting a war. It is this that allows us to unilaterally cut our Armed Forces and tangibly reduce defense spending. So there is now clearly no direct threat from that quarter.

The threat comes from another quarter, to which I would like to pay particular attention. The same U.S. draft federal budget and state budgets in the country in the next fiscal year will allocate $353 billion to education—considerably more than the Pentagon. But what about our country? We have allocated R47.5 billion for public education and culture (together!) compared with defense spending this year of R77.3 billion. This, in my view, is where there is one more genuine threat! These figures conceal a lag in the training and education of the rising generation and in creating the country's intellectual potential. We can make every effort to build hundreds of extra missiles or planes. But are these the only things that define power and security nowadays? The answer is obvious.

China

Parliamentary Delegation To Visit China 12 Sep

Lukyanov To Head Delegation

OW1009104689 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0200 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Text] A Supreme Soviet delegation of the Soviet Union will begin their visit to China on 12 September. Comrade Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, candidate member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and first deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, will lead the delegation.

Comrade Lukyanov was interviewed by Moscow Radio before the Soviet parliamentary delegation departure for China.

Please tune in for the recorded interview on 10 September at 2100 Beijing time [1200 GMT].

Lukyanov Grants Pre-Visit Interview

OW1109004689 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Interview with Anatoliy I.Lukyanov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by special correspondents Plevakho and (Feoktisov), at the Kremlin on 9 September—questions read by announcer; responses by Lukyanov recorded in Russian fading into Mandarin translation]

[Text] Dear listeners, a delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet will leave Moscow for Beijing by plane in the early evening of 11 September. The delegation will be led by A. Lukyanov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. On 9 September, he was interviewed at the Kremlin by Moscow Radio special correspondents Plevakho and (Feotistov). Please listen to the recorded interview.

[Question] Anatoliy Ivanovich, the delegation led by you will be the first Soviet parliamentary delegation to visit China since the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. As the head of the delegation, what are your feelings on the eve of your departure? What do you think will be the significance of your forthcoming meetings with your Chinese counterpart? What is your mission?

[Lukyanov] I think that our main task is to continue what was started by Gorbachev in his talks with Chinese leaders during last summit meeting. The talks have promoted cooperation between the two sides. A Chinese science and technology day activity has been held in the Soviet Union. Ryzhkov has held talks with members of a Chinese delegation. There has also been a meeting of the Soviet-Chinese Intergovernmental Commission on Trade and Economic Cooperation. All these have contributed greatly to the development of Soviet-Chinese relations and to the implementation of the agreements reached at the summit meeting. Similar progress should also be made now in the relations between the highest organs of state power of the two countries, which are a main part of the relations between the two countries. I should say that it was the parliamentary contacts that paved the way for the summit meeting. A Chinese parliamentary delegation visited our country in 1985. Then, a Soviet parliamentary delegation visited China. Later on, there were several meetings between the USSR Supreme Soviet, including its various committees, and the Chinese side. We may say that those meetings paved the way for the summit meeting. What I would like to discuss now is that, after the normalization of bilateral relations, we should also develop the relations between the two parties while developing the relations between states.

The parliaments can do many things because parliamentary contacts are to a great extent the contacts between parliamentarians who are close to the people. We may say that it is the people's diplomacy between countries. The parliament embodies historical experience. All the Soviet working people have the experience of our relations with China, particularly our relations with China in the 1950's. The parliament is the nucleus of the state organs for national construction. This means that the relations between central and local legislative bodies are determined by the relations among various administrative departments of the executive organ, by the relations among various regions and cities, and by the relations among public security, judicial and supervisory organs. Therefore, the parliament is a special part of these relations. We understand this fact. For this reason, the delegation going to China is very representative. It is composed of members of five major Supreme Soviet committees and people of four nationalities and of various professions, such as doctors, astronauts, composers and science academy presidents, in addition to Soviet deputies. Leaving for China, we are looking forward to meeting the great Chinese people. Yet, on the other hand, we feel great responsibility to our people for maintaining and developing the relations that, we think, should be developed between the two countries. It is very important that we should develop the relations in deeds, not in words.

[Question] Anatoliy Ivanovich, the Chinese people are greatly interested in the reforms in our country. This has been shown by many letters that we have received from Chinese listeners. Questions concerning our reforms cover a very wide range of topics. I would like to know your views about the political reform in our country. It seems to me that your are very familiar with this matter. What stage is our political reform in? How is it proceeding? Are there difficulties on the road of political reform?

[Lukyanov] I think that the first stage of the political reform was linked to the first meeting of the Supreme Soviet. We may say that the start of the political reform has brought about the greatest development in the democratic structure of our country. By relying radio and television, we have in fact made all the people in our country take part in the political reform. Take the more than 200 hours of live relay of the Supreme Soviet meetings for instance. We may say, without any exaggeration, that the relays turned those meetings into a general election by all the people under the political reform. Now, we are nearing the second stage of the reform, which deals with the elections of various republics and local organs of state power and local soviets.

Our legislation has been reformed. What will the 25 September and ensuing soviet meetings be like? They will deal with the solution of the most imperative problems in our society. For instance, the deputies now deliberate not only next year's plans and budget, but also such legislation as the law of ownership, land and use of land, the law of tenancy relations, the draft law on the taxation system, the plan for revising the law for cooperatives, and the regulations of socialist enterprises. In other words, the USSR Supreme Soviet will deliberate important issues, while striving to ensure law and order. Democracy is inseparable from discipline, law, and order. For this reason, we have recently adopted certain legal norms, mainly for the purpose of having all the people take part in ensuring law and order. I am the chairman of the Provisional Committee for Combatting Crime. We have said clearly that we are not combatting crime in an ordinary way, and with all available means permitted by law.

We are entering the second stage of political reform, which is inseparable from the economic reform, because they are related to each other. I do not doubt that there will be difficulties in the process, and the difficulties will be immense. We are being attacked from both the right and left. Some people want to keep their leading posts and a status quo. Others are trying to take a left approach to seize these posts. Our position is that we are afraid of neither left-leaning nor right-leaning tendencies, and we want to deepen reform. We have no other choice.

[Question] Anatoliy Ivanovich, no doubt we, in principle, should take our own road. However, we believe the experience of other socialist countries and fraternal parties is also useful. I would like to ask your view of our Chinese friends' experience. Perhaps one of the purposes of the visit is to study China's experience in this respect. Am I right?

[Lukyanov] I think you are right. We need to know more about China's experience in reform, both positive and negative. We should note that China's economic modernization drive and reform started earlier than ours. We are attentively watching China's progress. For instance, we are greatly interested in their giving more power to enterprises. We are also interested in their regulating market relations and opposing egalitarianism, and in breaking the system of the iron rice bowl as they put it. We are extremely interested in China's household contract and lease systems. We should thoroughly study and consider those practices. Each country has its own way, method, and approach to solving problems, as well as its own development pattern suitable to its own historical and cultural conditions. For this reason, we should understand this fact when we learn from other's experience. We do not impose our reform experience on anyone, but we shall be glad if someone is interested in our experience. We are very interested in the experience of other countries, particularly socialist countries, in tapping every potential of socialism to make the people prosperous. No doubt, we shall study China's practices in connection with the development of factories, trade, enterprises, and cooperatives from this angle. To my knowledge, we shall be able to visit China's enterprises. It is a good thing to do. It is never too late or too early to learn. We need to learn all the time.

[Question] You and I are of the same generation, and we both graduated from Moscow University. You were in the Department of Law, while I was in the Department of History. Do you remember our contacts with Chinese college students and friends in the past? It was a different kind of relationship then, before the cold war. What is your recent experience in associating with Chinese comrades? Are you attracted by anything in China? Do you know anyone there? These are, of course, personal questions, but I think our listeners are interested.

[Lukyanov] In this respect, I am lucky. At that time, the First Association of Fellow Provincials of Chinese College Students was founded, led by Comrade (Wang Tong). I attended its activities in the first few days after its founding. I am glad that many leaders in the People Republic of China today know about that association, and once experienced the warmth between the young and working people of our country and those of the People's Republic of China. We should use past experience and, of course, we should also do away with the excesses of those years. In principle, we are not talking about restoring our relations to those of the 1950's, but we should closely shut the door of confrontation and cold war which once existed. Both sides have done so, and it has not been easy to have walked along this section of the road.

However, from another point of view, we must develop, in the new stage, a fresh relationship, conforming with the current trend. I think that the main thing is to talk less and drink less toasts to friendship, and to consolidate our efforts for cooperation with concrete action. Through our ties in the fields of economy, trade, science, and technology, we should study each other's experiences and try to consolidate them. We should also further develop cooperation between our parties, youth, and trade unions. There is a bright future in this connection. However, we must calmly carry out our work and forge ahead, so that Marx can say in the nether world that you have done a good job in planting the (?tree).

[Question] Anatoliy Ivanovich, the Chinese audience heard your speech prior to your visit to China. Therefore, I hope you will say something to the Chinese audience here.

[Lukyanov] As far as I am concerned, China is not only a great nation, with a completely independent human civilization, an ancient culture, and peculiar revolution, but a large human continent, with which I have intellectual ties. When I come home from work very tired, I often take a volume of good ancient Chinese poetry, such as the "Tang Poetry" or the "Collection of Poems by Du Fu," in which there are many elegant and short poems, books by much respected writers, including Lao She and Zhao Fuli, or a volume of contemporary poetry by such a Chinese poet as Ai Qing, and this gives a very special insight into that country, a country with human emotions felt all over the world, but at the same time with its own coloring, especially China's own unique coloring. I think that much of what is taking place in the world today was born at the junction of many human philosophies. For example, Panchasila principles for one were born at the junction of Indian and Chinese philosophies. Russian culture, Rerikh ideas included, has made a contribution to this. Sun Yat-sen and Lenin contributed to this development too. So, for me, it is an entire spiritual continent and I am very happy to go to China. On the eve of the 40th anniversary of the Chinese revolution, I would like to wish that China's intellectual, historical traditions and its hardworking spirit, always typical of Chinese farmers and workers, develops. Traditions represent not only our past, but also our future and hope—a hope to develop socialist civilization.

[Question] Thank you. Please allow me to speak on behalf of the Moscow Broadcasting Station and wish your visit, a successful, exciting and interesting one. If possible, Radio Moscow would like you to give your impression of your visit some time.

[Lukyanov] We shall try our best to justify the Soviet people's hope, learn about China as much as possible, and put across the feelings of the Soviet people to the great Chinese people.

Spokesman on PRC Party Delegation Visit, Talks

OW0909081289 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Text] The CPC Central Committee delegation led by Zhu Liang, head of the International Liaison Department of the CPC Central Committee, started its working visit to the USSR on 7 September. During its stay in the Soviet Union, the CPC delegation will hold talks at the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee and discuss ties between the CPC and the CPSU and issues of mutual concern. This was announced by Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Perfilyev at a news conference on Friday. He said: The resumption of various relations between the CPC and the CPSU was agreed upon when Soviet leader Gorbachev visited China last May.

Leningrad-Shanghai Joint Venture Successful

OW0809095789 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 24 Aug 89

[From the "Along the Road of Friendship and Cooperation" feature program]

[Excerpts] The Leningrad (Luntan) Joint Venture, a partnership with Chinese garment factories, has over 2,000 workers. The enterprises' workshops are brightly illuminated. The fabrics they use are of fine quality, and the equipment, some imported from the FRG and the United States, is the most modern. [passage omitted]

The output of the enterprise has increased greatly as a result of its cooperation with garment manufacturers in the DPRK. However, it still could not satisfy the market demand for fashionable and pretty dresses. Depite its modern equipment and abundant supply of high-quality materials, the productivity of the enterprise was restricted because of labor shortages. This prompted the enterprise to establish new cooperative ties with foreign partners, including the Shanghai Foreign Trade Corporation.

How did ties with the Shanghai Foreign Trade Corporation begin? (Selivanovich), general manager of the (Luntan) corporation, said: Shanghai and Leningrad are sister cities. When a Shanghai delegation visited Leningrad last year, Chinese experts expressed their interest in visiting our corporation, and they became our guests. In Shanghai and in Leningrad, we and our Chinese partners discussed all sorts of cooperative plans. We subsequently signed a cooperation protocol stating that the two cities would cooperate to produce 1 million women's dresses this year and at least 2 million next year.

On what basis is Leningrad-Shanghai cooperation built? According to (Selevanovich), the Leningrad plant provides the materials and the cutting and tailoring technology, and the Shanghai workers complete all other working procedures. Part of the finished goods are given to the Shanghai workers as pay.

What will be the prospect of cooperation between the Leningrad plant and its Shanghai partner? According to (Selevanovich), he and his Shanghai partner have discussed all kinds of cooperation programs. He said: The Leningrad plant will probably hire Chinese experts to work at the Leningrad enterprise. We also plan to establish cooperative enterprises in Siberia and the Far East. [passage omitted]

Soviet-Chinese Railway Construction Begins

LD0809162289 Moscow TASS in English 1211 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Alma-Ata September 8 TASS—The Soviet Union and China have begun the construction of a railway to connect Soviet Kazakhstan with the Xinjiang-Uygur autonomous region of China.

Facilities to process cargo delivered by China are under construction at a Soviet border station.

The Soviet side plans to complete the modernisation of the steel track and station facilities by 1992, and China will build a 135 kilometer railway in the same period.

When connected, the two railways will form the shortest land route between Western Europe and the Asian-Pacific region and cut the time needed for the transportation of cargo from London to Shanghai. All cargo to the region from Western Europe previously had to be transported by sea.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Indonesian President Suharto Pays Official Visit

Arrives in Moscow 11 Sep

LD1109084289 Moscow TASS in English 0755 GMT 11 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 11 TASS—President Suharto of Indonesia arrived in Moscow from Leningrad today. He is currently on an official visit to our country at the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

At the airport the guest and his wife were welcomed by Anatoliy Lukyanov, alternate member of the Soviet Communist Party Politburo, first vice-president of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Lev Voronin, first vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, other officials.

Welcomed by Gorbachev in Kremlin

LD1109090189 Moscow TASS in English 0842 GMT 11 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 11 TASS—Indonesian President Suharto was met in a ceremony at the St. George Hall of the Grand Kremlin Palace. Suharto and his wife were warmly welcomed by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and his wife.

The Indonesian president arrived in Moscow from Leningrad today. He is staying in the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Arrives in Leningrad 9 Sep

BK1009055689 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1300 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Text] Today, President Suharto arrived in Leningrad from Uzbekistan. Yesterday, President Suharto made a trip to Samarkand and toured the ancient city's site where its architectural heritage is located. President Suharto also visited the famous Ismail Al Bukhari Mosque and had dialogues with Muslim ulemas.

Tours Samarkand Oblast 8 Sep

LD0809201589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 8 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Indonesian President Suharto and his wife are continuing to acquaint themselves with our country. Mukhtar Ganiyev, our corespondent in Uzbekistan, reports:

[Ganiyev] The Indonesian guest and the persons accompanying him arrived in Samarkand this morning and acquainted themselves with the sights of this ancient oriental city. [passage omitted]

In an animated conversation with figures from the Muslim religion, the president of the Republic of Indonesia and the persons accompanying him received information about the state of religious affairs and the life of the Muslims of Uzbekistan. It should be noted that the processes of perestroyka in our country have also been reflected in the lives of Muslim believers. In Uzbekistan, for example, new mosques are being opened, and the state has handed over to believers a very rare edition of the holy book, the Koran, and a number of religious buildings. Mr Suharto praised the people of the region for such careful treatment of their history and culture.

Mr and Mrs Suharto later returned to Tashkent.

The Indonesian guest was accompanied on his tour of the republic by Comrade Ibragimov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of Uzbekistan. [video shows Suharto and entourage visiting the sights of Samarkand]

Speaks at Samarkand Luncheon

BK0909070489 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1500 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Indonesian President Suharto's speech at the 8 September luncheon in Samarkand—read by announcer]

[Text] Your Excellency, Chairman of the Samarkand Oblast Executive Committee and Mrs (Ganiyeva)! Honorable audience!

I, my wife, and all members of the delegation, who are accompanying me, would like to extend boundless thanks for the hospitality and friendliness accorded us during a brief visit to Samarkand, a beautiful and famous city in the history of the Islamic culture. While in Tashkent yesterday, I said the historical relics of the past Islamic culture should be a pride for the Uzbek community, and in this regard, Samarkand has a special position. The past important role of Samarkand has been proved by the historical relics which we can see here such as the ruins of the Bibi Khanum Mosque built by Timur in 1399, the Ulugh Beg School built in 1417, the Shirdar School built in 1619, the Tilakari School built in 1646, and the famous Gur Amir Mausoleum of Timur himself. I, my wife, and all members of my delegation are greatly impressed by the historical relics in Samarkand.

Audience! I have witnessed that the people here enjoy freedom to practice their own religious duties. We the Indonesian people with the Pancasila state ideology, also give all citizens freedom to practice their respective religious duties. Pancasila as Indonesia's state ideology is an entity of five principles, that is:

— Belief in One God;

—Just and Civilized Humanity;

—The Unity of Indonesia;

—Democracy led by the wisdom of deliberations among representatives; and, — Social justice for all the people of Indonesia.

Based on this way of life, we develop fraternity and tolerance, including religious tolerance. The first principle of Pancasila, Belief in One God, shows the Indonesian people's recognition of One God. Although the majority of the 178 million Indonesian people profess Islam, other religions are given freedom to flourish in an atmosphere of peace because religious freedom is guaranteed by our Constitution.

Honorable guests! Over the past 2 decades, the Indonesian people have implemented development through a series of 5-year development plans which are now on the way to a take-off. While the Soviet Union is actively implementing perestroyka, glasnost, and democratization, we the Indonesian people are making efforts to accelerate the pace of development by motivating the creativity of citizens in building their future and by enhancing efficiency.

On this occasion, I would like to express my hope that development being implemented in Uzbekistan would achieve results desired by the government and its people.

Finally, let me invite all guests to toast and drink together to the health and happiness of Mr (Ganiyev) and Mrs (Ganiyeva), the prosperity of the people of the Samarkand Oblast, and eternal friendship between the Soviet Union and Indonesia.

Thank you!

Speaks With Uzbek Leader

BK0909055089 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1300 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Yesterday, President Suharto held talks with Mirzaolim Ibragimov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. During the talks, President Suharto called for the strengthening and development of relations between Indonesia and the Soviet Union. President Suharto underscored the urgency of international efforts in the struggle for a war-free, just, and progressive world.

Feted in Tashkent 7 Sep

LD0709133589 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 7 Sep 89

[Text] Tashkent September 7 TASS—President Suharto of Indonesia and his wife arrived in the capital of Uzbekistan today on their way to Moscow on an official visit at the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Indonesian president was welcomed at the airport by Mirzaolim Ibragimov, vice-president of the USSR Supreme Soviet and president of the Presidium of Uzbekistan's Supreme Soviet, and other officials.

In a meeting at the Presidium of Uzbekistan's Supreme Soviet, Ibragimov stated that the USSR cherished ties with Indonesia and hoped for the further development of the process that has become obvious in bilateral relations of late.

"We believe that the current visit will give a fresh impetus to bilateral ties in various areas and bring Soviet-Indonesian cooperation to a qualitatively higher level," he said.

Suharto favoured the consolidation and development of relations between the two countries. He stated that the Indonesian people remembered well the Soviet Union's assistance to them at a time of hardships.

Stressing the importance of concerted efforts worldwide to build a world without wars, a world of justice and progress, the president emphasised that this principal goal was above differences in the political and ideological spheres.

Suharto laid a wreath to the tomb of the unknown soldier and visited the exhibition of Uzbekistan's economic achievements.

A dinner in honour of the Indonesian president was given on behalf of the republican Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Business Cooperation Developed With Indonesia

LD0809132289 Moscow TASS in English 1209 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—The development of new forms of economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Indonesia will lead to greater stability and balancing in mutual trade, businessmen from the two countries told TASS today.

Now that the two countries are elaborating measures to develop bilateral commercial relations, a search for unconventional ways to strengthen cooperation is timely, as the first positive results are already becoming apparent.

The Soviet Selkhozpromeksport foreign trade amalgamation and the Indonesian Prima Comexindo firm have recently signed an agreement to set up a tea-processing joint venture in Indonesia. The two organisations have also agreed to establish a joint venture to pack Indonesian tea imported to the Soviet Union.

Prima Comexindo intends to set up two joint ventures with the Moscow Mebel amalgamation to design, produce and sell furniture made of ordinary and tropical trees. One of the ventures will be based in Moscow, the other in Indonesia.

The Indonesian Karja Haitek Persada Company and the Krasnodar plant have agreed to cooperate in the production of vegetable oil. They also plan to set up a venture to process palm oil.

Existing and future joint ventures involve the food industry, timber processing and pharmaceuticals. The Soviet side believe that free economic zones in the Soviet Union, and, in particular, in the Soviet Far East, will open up broad prospects for Indonesian participation in this form of foreign economic activity.

Observers are in little doubt that the exchange of technologies and the latest achievements in various spheres is profitable for both sides. However, it is high time to elaborate a legal basis for the development of new and traditional forms of mutual economic cooperation.

Soviet and Indonesian business communities expect that this aspect of mutual relations will be discussed during the current visit of Indonesian President Suharto to the Soviet Union.

Near East & South Asia

Iaqi President's Personal Envoy Arrives 11 Sep

LD1109135589 Moscow TASS in English 1351 GMT 11 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 11 TASS—A personal envoy of Iraqi President Saddam Husayn, deputy foreign minister S. al-Faysal arrived in Moscow today. He was welcomed at moscow airport by Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov.

Shevardnadze, Iraq's 'Aziz Praise Relations

LD0809200689 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his Iraqi counterpart, Tariq 'Aziz, have exchanged congratulatory messages on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic ties.

Shevardnadze's message said that traditions of mutual respect and trust have been formed over the past years in relations between the USSR and Iraq, and fruitful, mutually beneficial cooperation has been established.

The aspiration of the two countries to further strengthen their relations rests on the solid foundation of the 1972 treaty on friendship and cooperation.

The Soviet foreign minister expressed confidence that friendly ties between the Soviet Union and Iraq will continue to develop in many areas and strengthen for the benefit of the Soviet and Iraqi peoples, in the name of peace and justice in the Near and Middle East and the world at large.

'Aziz's message noted that the time has proved the strength and depth of the relations of friendship and fruitful, constructive cooperation between Iraq and the USSR.

He reaffirmed his country's aspiration to strengthen ties with the friendly Soviet Union in the interests of the two nations, for the sake of enhancing their role in concerted efforts directed at attaining progress, peace, security and stability all over the world.

Afghan Minister Interviewed on 'Crucial Period'

LD1109114289 Moscow TASS in English 1046 GMT 11 Sep 89

["Mahmud Barialay Interviewed by TASS correspondent"—TASS headline]

[Text] Kabul September 11 TASS—By TASS correspondent Yuriy Tyssovskiy:

"Afghanistan is living these days through a crucial period of its history. At stake is the question of whether the country will embark upon the road of democratic development, the road of reconstruction and progress or it will be returned to the times of medieval obscurantism", your correspondent was told by Mahmud Barialay, first deputy chairman of the Executive Committee of the Afghan Council of Ministers. He noted that after the signing of the Geneva accords and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, a direct intervention against the republic was unleashed by the United States, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and their mercenaries from the armed opposition with the only purpose of stamping out the rule of the people. The designs of the counter-revolutionaries have failed, however. During the past half a year the rebels were unable to attain any of the goals set by Washington.

Mahmud Barialay said that the struggle, waged in the country's territory, was not only of a military, but also of a propagandistic, psychological and, what is most important, of an economic character. By waging a "war on the roads" the rebels are endeavouring to starve us out. I wish to note the noble stand of the Soviet Union, which is rendering Afghanistan unselfish aid in all domains. We now have much greater capabilities to thwart the economic blockade. The country's main arteries: Kabul-Hayraton, Kabul-Jalalabad, Turgundi- Shindand-Qandahar are open for traffic. All enemy attempts to block the highways have been torpedoed. I can assure you that there will be no difficulties with supplies to Kabul. The capital is provided with sufficient amounts of food. Substantial reserves have been stockpiled for the winter period. The situation is more difficult with fuel. We are compelled to allocate the bulk of our reserves to the army in wartime conditions. Mobilised for cargo haulages are not only trucks from the state automobile pool, but vehicles belonging to private organisations, army transport facilities.

The Afghan leadership, Mahmud Barialay said, is set on pursuing consistently the policy of national reconciliation and there are no disagreements within the party on this score. Kabul's peaceful initiatives are well known. We offer our opponents to cease fire, to set up a coalition government without any discrimination, to carry out general free elections.

The extremists reject such a method of stopping the bloodshed. They stake on armed force. Why? Because the Peshawar ringleaders are not sure at all that the people will vote for them at such elections. Any attempt to bar the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan from the effort to settle Afghanistan's destiny are absolutely groundless. The opposition and its supporters in Washington and Islamabad must reconcile themselves to this reality, must realise the futility of the course to replace the government by military means, must give the Afghans an opportunity to make their option themselves.

East Europe

Mazowiecki's Cabinet Nominees Detailed

PM0809152189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent L. Toporkov dispatch: "Poland: Government Composition Presented"]

[Text] Warsaw—On 7 September T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, presented to M. Kozakiewicz, marshal of the Sejm, his list of cabinet nominees. Next the Sejm commissions will hold hearings at which the nominees will appear.

Let us start by mentioning a number of surprises. The prime minister has proposed Krzysztof Skubiszewski, a nonparty man and professor of international law, for the keenly contested post of foreign minister. He is 63 years old. He graduated from Poznan University, spent many years in teaching, and is now a staff member of the Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law. As minister of culture and art the Prime minister is proposing Izabella Cywinska, a theater producer and director of Poznan's New Theater. She is 54 years old. She graduated from Warsaw University Philosophy Department and then completed Higher Theatrical School. As IZVESTIYA has already reported, the news of the Prime Minister's nomination reached her in Omsk where she is working on a play at the theater there. The nomination for the post of Minister of labor and social security is Jacek Kuron, a well-known Solidarity figure, active participant in the roundtable talks, journalist, politician, and now a Sejm deputy. He is 55. The nomination for minister of industry is Tadeusz Syryjczyk, aged 41. He is a graduate and currently a staff member of the mining and metallurgical academy in Krakow and one of the founders of the Krakow industrial society. All the aforementioned candidates apart from K. Skubiszewski represent Solidarity.

As expected, the posts of minister of internal affairs and minister of national defense have been offered respectively to General C. Kiszczak and General F. Siwicki (Polish United Workers Party) [PZPR]. They are both simultaneously candidate deputy premiers. IZVESTIYA recently acquainted its readers in depth with the biography of C. Kiszczak. Florian Siwicki is also well known in our country through his many years of work in the Polish Ministry of National Defense. After difficult and lengthy negotiations three further posts have been allocated to the PZPR—the ministries of foreign trade and transport as well as the post of minister without portfolio. Solidarity has the largest number of government posts—nine.

Addressing a session of the PZPR Deputies' Club, C. Kiszczak noted that the structure of the Ministry of Internal Affairs must now be altered in keeping with the political changes in the country. In particular, it is necessary to scrap the third department, hitherto the so-called "superstructure," and the fourth department, which dealt with questions connected with religious organizations. Some other agencies will also be closed down.

The session was also addressed by Gen Siwicki. He described plans for the further reduction of the Polish Armed Forces and purchases of military hardware. The general noted that military service in the army may be reduced to 18 months in the future. To the question of whether Soviet troops will remain on Polish territory F. Siwicki replied that their complete withdrawal may be possible when the latest round of talks in Vienna is complete.

The United Peasant Party Deputies' Club named its four candidates at a session held behind closed doors.

Parliamentary commissions are now going to hold an immediate examination of all the nominees. It is to be completed in the shortest possible time because a plenary session of the Sejm is planned for 12 September at which the composition of the cabinet will be approved and Tadeusz Mazowiecki, the chairman of the government, will deliver a program speech.

Cabinet Formation Continues

LD0909164189 Moscow TASS in English 1623 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Text] Warsaw September 9 TASS—By TASS correspondent Andrey Pershin:

Poland has made another step towards forming a new government: Eight commissions of the Polish Sejm have started to discuss candidates for ministerial posts.

Polish Prime Minister T. Mazowiecki met with Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski on Friday to brief him on the results of negotiations with the leaders of political parties, public and trade union organisations and their proposals on the composition of a new Polish Government. Jaruzelski approved Mazowiecki's efforts to form a broad coalition government and expressed the hope that a new government will be able to carry out social and economic reforms in the interests of the Polish state and people.

General of the armour Czeslaw Kiszczak, who is running for the post of deputy prime minister and minister of internal affairs from the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP) for almost three hours answered questions put by parliamentarians. He presented a comprehensive program to restructure the work of the Polish Internal Affairs Ministry in new conditions. The Sejm administration and internal affairs commission finally recommended Kiszczak with one vote against.

Aleksander Bentkowski, candidate for the justice minister from the United Peasants' Party (ZSL), had to answer more than 50 questions before betting the recommendation of the Sejm.

The Sejm's commission for ties with Poles living abroad approved the nomination of a non-party lawyer, Pr. Krysztof Skubiszewski for the post of minister of foreign affairs.

The Sejm commissions will continue hearings on Saturday and Sunday. However, their opinion is not obligatory for the prime minister.

The list of nominees offered by Tadeusz Mazowiecki and published by the press is not full, because not all questions of the formation of a new government have been agreed upon to the end.

Mazowiecki handed over his proposals on additional candidates to Marshal of the Sejm Mikolaj Kozakiewicz on Friday. E. Osijatnynski from the Civil Parliamentary Club was nominated for the head of the State Planning Office, M. Swieczycki (PUWP)—for the minister of foreign trade. M. Kujarski (Democratic Party) was offered for the post of minister without portfolio who will be in charge of the Organisation of Communications Ministry. The Solidarity trade union of individual peasants nominated A. Balazs for the post of minister without portfolio in charge of the social sphere, public health, culture and education in rural areas.

Yesterday's meeting of the Presidium of the ZSL chief committee which discussed the results of consultaitons on forming a new government, has brought to light contradictions inside the so-called new Solidarity coalition. The committee reacted negatively to the proposal of the Polish prime minister to apoint C. Janicki to the post of deputy prime minister and minister of agriculture, forestry and the food industry. The proposal contradicted the previous decision of the ZSL deputies club to recommend Kazimierz Olesiak for this post. Olesiak had held this post in Mieczyslaw Rakowski's government.

The Presidium of the ZSL chief committee has issued a statement claiming that Olesiak is the only competent candidate from the United Peasants' Party.

Solidarity Judged 'Considerably More Seriously'

LD0809141989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 8 Sep 89

[From the "International Situation: Questions and Answers" program]

[Excerpts] Pensioner Kolakhundova from Ufa asks the following question: What concessions is Poland's Solidarity making? All of these well-wishers, the listener continues, evidently referring to Solidarity officials, are striving to alter the borders of Poland. My colleague, Viktor Levin, will reply to this question.

[Levin] I fear that this question has been prompted by an incorrect impression of Solidarity. True, the blame for this lies more with our mass media than with the listener. Not so long ago our impression was that Solidarity meant extremism, antisocialism, and betrayal of Polish interests. A basis for this was found in quoting actual extremist statements by individual leaders of that time, who, by the way, are not heard now making harsh statements but mostly speak in conjectures. Fortunately, everything moves on and changes. We now judge Solidarity considerably more seriously, and Solidarity itself has clarified many issues.

Today the Polish reality is such that in the country there are two determining political forces, the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] and Solidarity. Now they are striving not to pull Poland in different directions, but to act together in the national interests. Let us return to the question asked by our listener. First of all, I do not know of any facts which would indicate a possible agreement by solidarity to alter borders to the detriment of Poland. Second, Mazowiecki, in one of his first statements, stressed the government's intention of respecting the obligations arising from the Warsaw Pact. I will add that one can consider as settled the question of the PZPR's receiving the posts of minister of national defense and minister of internal affairs. I will not risk saying what other posts in the government will be occupied by communists, although I know that there will be some. But concerning the Ministries of National Defense and Internal Affairs everything is already clear.

I will say even more: I have no doubt of the patriotism of the Solidarity leaders, and patriots do not barter away the future of their country.

GDR's Schabowski Discusses Socialist Achievements

LD0809112889 Moscow TASS in English 1058 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Berlin 8/9 TASS—The GDR news agency ADN reports:

GDR/socialism—Socialist Achievements Will Not Be Abandoned—GDR Politician

Berlin (ADN)—There is nothing that makes the capitalist exploiter system less abominable today than 40 or 70 years ago, Politburo Member Guenter Schabowski has told officials of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) in Berlin.

That was why there was no reason to abandon proven socialist principles and achievements, to give up living socialism to a revival of capitalism, he said.

Referring to Western demands for reforming socialism along capitalist lines, Schabowski said nowhere had capitalism lost any of its defects which communists had stood up to fight.

Socialism, he underlined, was a continuous process of creative search for better solutions to new tasks, a process of deep-going political, economic, social and intellectual changes.

Continuity and change were topical and lasting features of the programme of the SED, the GDR's leading party.

The task was to see to it that in respectful cooperation with all the people the scope of socialist democracy was used in such a way that everybody considered the GDR his or her very own achievement, as a guarantee for the respect of their interests and for the expectations of a humane present and future.

GDR Criticizes West German Refugee 'Campaign'

LD0809112289 Moscow TASS in English 1047 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Berlin 8/9 TASS—The GDR news agency ADN reports:

Hypocritical FRG Campaign in a Style Reminiscent of Greater Germany Mania, Paper Says

Berlin (ADN)—JUNGE WELT, youth daily of the German Democratic Republic, on Friday carries a commentary on the hypocritical campaign launched in media of the Federal Republic of Germany over the alleged "immense distress of refugees" from the GDR.

Referring to the duty to act as a custodian for GDR citizens the FRG government has arrogated to itself JUNGE WELT says:

"In all these cases the FRG authorities do not leave things at words. They issue temporary FRG travel documents, passports and other documents, nota bene, to GDR citizens. But could it be different when even Chancellor Helmut Kohl uses meetings of the Bundestag (parliament), which should exclusively deal with domestic questions to make inflammatory speeches reminiscent of the ill-famed Greater Germany mania. And all that at a time when the Bundestag is preparing bills to even better and more ruthlessly deport undesirable aliens seeking asylum in the FRG."

The paper goes on: "What is striking about all this: The bigger the crocodile tears the smaller the inclination of those shedding them to waste even a single thought on how their doings might be reconciled with the treaties concluded with the GDR."

"It is not necessary to consult U.N. documents to realize the presumptuous nature of this so-called "duty to provide custody for GDR citizens", for it violates commitments undertaken in general and in detail in the treaty on the bases of relations between the GDR and the FRG of December 21, 1972.

Article 4 of that treaty says: "The GDR and the FRG proceed from the consideration that neither of the two states may represent the other in international affairs or act on its behalf."

Article 6 reads: "The GDR and the FRG proceed from the principle that the sovereign power of either state shall be confined to its respective territory. They shall respect the independence and autonomy of either state in its internal and external affairs."

The daily states: "Both the GDR and the FRG had made it clear that by signing these treaties they did not mean to deny differences in basic questions concerning their societies but recognized that the FRG is a capitalist and the GDR a socialist state. This never posed an obstacle to reaching a high level of good-neighbourly cooperation for the benefit of both sides."

Hungary Allows East German Refugees To Leave

LD1109072289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 11 Sep 89

[Text] Beginning today, GDR citizens who are on Hungarian territory and do not wish to return home may leave for any country ready to take them. This was the decision on the GDR refugees made by the Hungarian Government. Hungary has temporarily halted actions of the corresponding paragraphs of the 1969 intergovernmental agreement with the GDR. The MTI agency stresses in this connection that the Hungarian government is guided by universally accepted international principles of respect for human rights. During the past week, Budapest has been constantly occupied by the issues relating to the GDR citizens who are on Hungarian territory and wish to leave for the FRG. Negotiations between the GDR and FRG have not yielded results.

[Moscow World Service in English at 0700 GMT broacasts a similar report, adding: "In Berlin the ADN news agency has criticized the decision of the Hungarian authorities, saying this was interference in the internal affairs of the German Democratic Republic."]

Hungarian Socialism, Role of Party Discussed

LD1009211689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Sep 89

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] [Shishlin] As you understand, each country has its own concerns, each country has its path to tomorrow. But, with this reservation I want to say that, nevertheless, the changes which are taking place in a number of socialist countries—and to a certain extent they concern and affect all socialist countries—these changes in themselves have something resembling a certain common denominator. This is an answer to the problems which socialist society is coming up against in its development. This is an answer to the contradictions which have arisen in the course of building a new society. And various answers are being sought. Well, we now have Budapest on the line: Yevgeniy Petrovich, good day!

[Shirokov] Hello!

[Shishlin] As you understand, everyone in the Soviet Union has a lively interest in events in Hungary. My first question to you: Who now determines the political weather in Hungary? What forces?

[Shirokov] The reality is as follows. The Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP], having proclaimed at the start of the year the possibility of Hungary's further development within the framework of a multiparty system, is now holding a regular dialogue with representatives of the so-called opposition roundtable and in this process is agreeing to certain compromises, concessions, that it is to say, it is in a sense beforehand giving up a share of its influence to its rivals. It must be said that in this studio from which the "Hirado" ["Newsreel"] goes out every day—this is similar to our "Vremya" program—one can often find representatives of the most diverse parties who express views which are sometimes far removed from the interests of even socialism.

Well, parliamentary elections are coming up. During these elections, as some leading MSZMP figures admit, the party may not receive the majority but may have, say, one-third of the seats in the composition of the future parliament and will thus have to enter into some sort of coalition relationship already within the framework of the future government with the forces which are today sharply criticizing what was done during the previous 40 years.

By the way, the first lesson is as follows: At a few recent byelections to parliament, in three out of four cases not representatives of the MSZMP won, but representatives of the Hungarian Democratic Forum, after the party of Hungarian communists perhaps the most influential force in today's Hungarian society, and this lesson is already being taking into account.

But the situation is also complicated by the fact that the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party itself is now going through a crucible of heated discussions, through the clash of various currents and platforms.

[Shishlin] It is clear of course that the Roundtable which is permanently functioning in Hungary has fairly sharp corners. [chuckles] And how is the economic situation in the country?

[Shirokov] Well, I think that from many reports our television viewers know that this situation is not getting any better. And in the last week it is being said that it is becoming also more alarming. I have in mind the latest rise in prices for a whole group of consumer goods in which perhaps a special column is taken up by meat and meat products. Well, on the whole, inflation is running at a faster rate than was envisaged.

Really, the difficulties are mainly due to Hungary's foreign debt. The current debt, $18 billion—$14.5 billion net is exactly double the figure we spoke of literally 2 years ago. Now there are already some 20,000 unemployed in Hungary and in the long-term a figure of 100,000 and 200,000 is mentioned. 2,500 Million forints have been invested in order for these people either to receive benefits or to requalify. Briefly, the picture here is as follows: A great many fundamental steps are being taken towards creating a stronger economy, based mainly on market relations, toward reprivatizating property, toward changing the forms of ownership, toward giving foreign capital freer access to the Hungarian economy. But, alas, for the time being the situation remains but a little encouraging as far as this is concerned.

[Shishlin] And how in Hungary do they see our Soviet perestroyka, our affairs, our concerns?

[Shirokov] I will once again refer to this studio, which today has been kindly been made available for our conversation. Preparations are already underway here for the next broadcast. And I must say that not one of these Hungarian programs is without a few materials from the Soviet Union, these being concerned with the most critical, the most burning subjects of our reality. The economy, politics and of late Hungarian society's close attention to our national problems.

I must say that our experience, say in the economy, is being examined very closely, in a highly hypercritical way and the assessments are often not very flattering to us, shall we say.

We are, for instance, being very much criticized in connection with the fact that despite many restructuring processes in the economy, Hungary has, for the time being, found itself in the role of creditor vis a vis the Soviet Union. According to the latest data the deficit amounts to over R600 million. On the whole, the conclusion is being drawn that these restructuring processes of ours could also proceed more quickly. In short our perestroyka which was once simply an attractive factor and brought about many democratic processes here in Hungary, is now becoming a factor of very serious conclusions, of serious analysis.

[Shishlin] Thank you, Yevgeniy Petrovich, all the best to you.

Well, I agree, of course one must not take a simplified approach to what is taking place in Hungary. But, equally, one must not take a simplified approach to what is taking place in Poland, to what is taking place in the Soviet Union. It is clear of course that the future holds much that is unexpected but to a decisive extent it depends on us and it seems to me that it is worth recalling the warning in the form of a question which has been handed down to us from antiquity. This warning in the form of a question runs as follows: If the trumpet's sound is indistinct who will gird their loins for battle?

Achievements of Hungary's 'Roundtable' Noted

PM1109145589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent F. Lukyanov dispatch: "Hungary: Toward Stabilization Through Glasnost. 'Roundtable' Talks"]

[Text] Budapest—After 2 or 3 weeks when it seemed that the talks to coordinate interests around a common national tripartite "roundtable" were deadlocked and virtually on the verge of breaking down, the development of events in the past few days has seemed to refute the pessimistic forecasts.

It was not hard to foresee that the "roundtable" talks would be difficult. As is well known, representatives of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP], the "roundtable" opposition, and, finally, a number of social organizations unconnected either with the MSZMP or with the opposition are taking part in them. The sides' platforms—particularly those of the MSZMP and the "roundtable" opposition—on the most important issues relating to the "transitional" period (the "roundtable" was set up to work out these positions) often differ fundamentally.

Nonetheless, a considerable amount of work has been done between 13 June, when the talks started, and the start of August. Thus, for instance, the MSZMP agreed that the current State Assembly, 80 percent of whose deputies are MSZMP members, should examine and ratify the drafts of the country's most important laws only after they are approved around the common national "roundtable." It was jointly decided that the country's new constitution should be ratified by the new parliament, which will be formed after the general election on a multiparty basis. However, the sides' positions on many other issues nonetheless remained very far apart.

Until recently it was hard to say just what was the restraining factor at the talks—the inflexibility of the MSZMP's position or the excessive claims by the opposition, whose confidence increased after the State Assembly by-elections. I recall that in three out of the four districts opposition candidates won by a wide margin. Obviously the fact that, by prior agreement among the sides, the talks were held behind closed doors proved an impediment. Incidentally, this fact gave rise to objections from the very start of the talks.

Nonetheless common sense, a sense of reality, and a readiness to compromise for the sake of national consensus ultimately prevailed. Clearly, it was no accident that the ending of the last few days of deadlock at the talks coincided with a breakthrough in the sphere of glasnost in the talks themselves. From now on not just the newspapers but the TV as well will have access to information firsthand, so to say.

So, on what other questions apart from the aforementioned issue did it prove possible to overcome differences and achieve around the "roundtable" the consensus that the country has been waiting so long for and needs so much? Above all on the question of the institution of the presidency, which the opposition did not even want to mention until recently, stubbornly claiming that the introduction of the post of president would currently benefit only the MSZMP.

The post of president will be introduced in place of the current collective organ—the 21-man Hungarian Presidium—and, lawyers believe, the president should be a reliable guarantor of the division of power as well as a strong stabilizing factor under the conditions of Hungary's current political life.

The important agreement on electoral legislation, on the basis of which the forthcoming multiparty general election for the new parliament will be held, could be listed as another asset.

Nonetheless, of course, there are still plenty of problems at the talks. Agreement on a draft law on parties is making particularly slow progress. In this regard the opposition is literally "fixated" on the question of MSZMP property, demanding that it be divided up. The MSZMP, for its part, rejects the opposition's demands, stating that its property mainly comprises party membership dues. The opposition also insists that the party end its activities at places of work immediately.

MSZMP Chairman R. Nyers has stated that he will not propose to the Central Committee that the MSZMP "leave the workplace," although it is necessary to switch party work gradually to places of residence. Nyers noted that I. Pozsgay, leader of the MSZMP delegation at the "roundtable" talks, had been authorized to agree to end activities by MSZMP organizations in the courts, the Prosecutor's Office, and government organs. At the same time, as Nyers put it, Pozsgay was not authorized to accept the proposal to end party organizations' activities at enterprises.

Pozsgay himself noted in an interview with MTI that, if the MSZMP Central Committee decides that party organizations should remain at enterprises and institutions, it will mean that every party will be entitled to set up such organizations.

Yugoslav Defense Secretary Arrives in Moscow

LD1109100389 Moscow TASS in English 0932 GMT 11 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 11 TASS—The Yugoslav Defence Minister Colonel-General Veljko Kadijevic, arrived in Moscow today on an official visit at the invitation of General Dmitriy Yazov, defense minister of the Soviet Union.

West Europe

Gorbachev To Visit Italy in November, Meet Pope

LD1109084389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0230 GMT 11 Sep 89

[From the "120 Minutes" program; announcer-read ASSOCIATED PRESS report]

[Text] A report from Rome, ASSOCIATED PRESS: As you know, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is to visit Italy in November. The Soviet ambassador in Rome has made an announcement stating that during the course of the visit there will be a meeting between Comrade Gorbachev and the Pope.

Gusev-Led Group Holds Economic Talks in Italy

PM1109132389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Ties Strengthen"]

[Text] Rome, 7 Sep—The delegation that is here under the leadership of V.K. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, met 6 September with Italian Deputy Premier Claudio Martelli, Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis; Renato Ruggiero, minister of foreign trade; and Adolfo Battaglia, minister of industry.

During the talks, which were held in an amicable and cordial [dobroserdechnyy] atmosphere, opinions were exchanged on issues relating to the development of bilateral economic relations. Both sides pointed to the potential for their expansion.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Defends Perestroyka in 9 Sep Address

LD0909185789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Video address by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet chairman, presented on the "Vremya" newscast on 9 September—recorded; Moscow PRAVDA in Russian published Gorbachev's speech on page 1 of its 10 September Second Edition; the PRAVDA item, entitled "Speech on Central TV by M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet," has been compared with the Moscow TV version; variations are noted within the following text]

[Text] Good evening, comrades. Today I am going to talk to you about the present moment. The situation in the country is not simple. We know all this and we all sense this. Everything is bound up in a tight knot: the acute state of the consumer market, the conflicts in interethnic relations, and the difficult and sometimes even painful processes going on in the public's consciousness that are connected with overcoming the deformations and with renovating socialism.

The people are trying to grasp where we stand at the present moment, what are the pluses and minuses of the road we have covered in the past four-plus years, how democratization is developing and how economic and political reform is proceeding. Their desire to get at the true roots of our weaknesses—the disruptions in fulfilling specific programs of restructuring and in tackling pressing problems—is quite explicable, as is their desire to elucidate why it is that on some issues the situation is not only not improving, but has actually become more complicated. In short, highly charged discussion is a characteristic feature of the present moment in political life. However, at the same time the main thing—and special emphasis should be placed on this—is that the masses of the working people have begun moving. They are becoming increasingly actively involved in discussions of ways to tackle socioeconomic and political tasks. This, comrades, is of fundamental significance, since it brings a constructive and businesslike character to restructuring; in this way the alienation that had developed between the people and the authorities is being overcome.

One cannot help seeing something else, however. Something has been occurring recently in the raging maelstrom of discussion and events, something that cannot go unnoticed and unremarked. We are seeing how attempts to discredit restructuring are being made from both the conservative and the ultra-leftist positions, and sometimes, too, from openly anti-socialist positions. From the midst of this discordant choir scare stories of imminent chaos and arguments about the danger of a coup or even of civil war may be heard. It is a fact that some would like to create an atmosphere of alarm, of there being no way out, and of uncertainty in society. It is difficult to rid oneself of the impression that this is to someone's advantage; that they simply want to confuse people and urge them on to take ill-considered actions.

From essentially conservative positions there is an attempt to impose assessments of the situation that would prompt counteractions to perestroyka, and would form people's opinion that the processes of change which have begun must be halted or, as a minimum, slowed. They call for a return to the old, command methods of administration; otherwise, they say, there will be chaos.

From the ultra-left corner it is proposed that tasks that are most complex be tackled at a gallop, at one stroke, and without taking either the real possibilities or society's interests into account. This, moreover, is presented as concern for the people and as care for their welfare.

Recommendations have also appeared recently from which it follows that salvation [PRAVDA version places "salvation" in quotation marks] for all of us consists in one thing: renouncing socialist values and conducting perestroyka in a capitalist manner. This kind of thing exists, too. There is no need to say that this contradicts the essence of the perestroyka policy, which is aimed at the socialist renewal of society.

I would not like to be understood as meaning that the diversity of opinions now represents a hindrance, or that none of those with whom I am conducting a polemic is concerned about how things are going in the country. No—the issue lies elsewhere. The essential point is how this concern is transformed. Some are prepared to renounce perestroyka and return to the past. Others, supposing themselves to be resolute reformers [PRAVDA version places "resolute reformers" in quotation marks], are prepared to push the development of perestroyka onto a path of hasty decisions and of rash projects that contain more ambition than concern about the cause.

All this is very serious, comrades. I considered it necessary to speak out clearly on this subject. Yes, perestroyka is proceeding with difficulty. But this is, after all, a sharp turn—a revolution in the economy, in politics, in the spiritual sphere, in the very consciousness of man, and in the whole structure of our life. Furthermore, miscalculations have not been avoided either in practical work, and they have been allowed to occur after perestroyka was already in progress. But perestroyka has opened a real path toward the renewal of society, to its assumption of a new quality, and to the creation of a truly humane and democratic socialism. It has restored to our great country a sense of dignity and has given the Soviet person a feeling of freedom. It is a powerful source of social and spiritual and, I would say, patriotic energy for decades to come.

That being so, we must do all to develop perestroyka on the basis of the ideas and principles which the party has proclaimed. We must not give way to the tendency for anyone, under pressure from the difficulties that have crowded in upon us, to succeed in foisting doubt on society as to the correctness of the path we have chosen. We must not stop. We must go forward along the path of the reforms we have mapped out.

Society, as I understand it [PRAVDA version omits "as I understand it"], feels the exceptional importance of this moment. There is a growing understanding in the country's labor collectives, that it is not rational to expend our strength on squabbles of various sorts, and attempts to stratify society and set people against each other are altogether impermissible. There is an increasingly insistent demand that we should pool our efforts and improve our practical work in all areas of perestroyka. In this connection one can only welcome the fact that the working people are demanding much of the economic managers, the state, and party organs at all levels. The working people expect a greater resolve of them in implementing the policy of perestroyka, in organizing work in a new way, and in changing the present situation for the better throughout the country. People have begun to rid themselves of the illusions and a belief in simple and easy solutions, and the notion that someone will provide everything from above, ready made, and that someone will solve all the problems.

In their arguments one can hear it said increasingly often that we live in the way that we work, no better and no worse. I would only wish to add: Tomorrow, too, we will live as we work.

I consider it [PRAVDA version adds "very"] important that an understanding of the fact that perestroyka is linked first and foremost with labor, creative, intensive and highly productive labor, in which all one's strength and knowledge are applied, is gaining in strength in society. This is important in so far as recently in our country people have talked considerably less about labor and more about the distribution of wealth. One might think that perestroyka amounts merely to the redistribution of some mythical riches. It is a good thing that we are getting rid of this delusion, albeit with difficulty; and that the implementation of the principles of social justice in society is being increasingly linked not with the ill-starred levelling out but with the real labor contribution of the person.

The fact that positive changes are building up is also testified by the fact that the question of discipline and order and the problem of bad management have been discussed very sharply recently in society. Supporting this in every way, I want to say that we cannot tolerate the violations that are taking place everywhere of state, labor and technological discipline, hold-ups in the fulfillment of obligations under agreements between enterprises, republics, krays, and oblasts.

We cannot reconcile ourselves to a situation in which our national economy is in a feverish state on account of stoppages in the work of transport.

I also want to say something about strikes. If we embark upon that path in the resolution of our problems, then it could have dangerous consequences for society. The problems that arise must be solved by other methods, at the right time, so that they do not grow and acquire an unhealthy character. We must particularly not tolerate a situation in which very often enormous losses are allowed to take place of that which has been produced by labor, upon which material and financial resources have been expended.

I believe that people are right to raise the question of decisively lifting responsibility and discipline at every level.

Perestroyka and irresponsibility are incompatible with each other. They are antipodes.

In describing the contemporary state of our society, I cannot fail to mention the question of crime. In their examination of this most acute social issue at the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the deputies were unanimous that the most decisive measures must be taken here, first and foremost, indeed, in regard to organized crime, bribe-takers and speculators, and against all encroachments upon the property and dignity of citizens.

The strictest order must be established in all towns and populated settlements in the country. The Supreme Soviet considered it necessary on the basis of law to grant the militia and all law enforcement bodies wider opportunities in the fight against crime, to better equip them materially and technically, to increase the number of internal troops, and to raise the material position of staff. We must, however, be most exacting regarding all those who defend public order and socialist legality. This must all be done. Unless our entire society joins in this difficult fight, however, there can be no rapid change.

I am aware, and the press has reported, that in many industrial centers workers' volunteer militia groups and other formations have been set up to assist the law enforcement bodies. It is especially important that young people have responded to this. We are counting on their energetic activity and determination.

In a word, comrades, both at the center and locally, in all labor collectives, practical work to bring about perestroyka and to resolve the problems which have accumulated must be stepped up in every way possible. In the center, in the coming months fundamental decisions must be made relating both to urgent problems and to groundwork for the future. In fact this determines the particular—the especially important significance I would say—of the forthcoming second Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet session. The USSR Government is drawing up, and is to submit to the Congress of People's Deputies, a program of emergency measures to improve the economy, and first and foremost to normalize the consumer market. We believe this program should give clear answers as to how, and within what time frame, the most acute socio-economic problems will be solved. Society, I think, will not agree to this program failing to set out clearly specific measures, stages, schedules and the responsibility of central, republican, and local bodies, and labor collectives.

Such a package of measures may, I admit, contain measures which are unpopular, harsh in some respects, and to some degree painful. This will be justified only in the event that they are indeed dictated by the necessity of extricating ourselves from the situation that has arisen.

Shortages, which give rise to the greatest amount of criticism and dissatisfaction among the people, are a special issue. The government must present a report on this acute social issue, as well as practical measures for the immediate future.

Major decisions relating to further deepening economic and political reform are to be adopted at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. First and foremost, these involve such a fundamental law as the law on ownership, adoption of which will make it possible to overcome man's alienation from the means of production and to create incentives for indepedent creative work. The law on land and land use, lease and leasing relations, is closely linked to this. A fundamental step is thereby being made in developing production relations in all sectors of the economy and in establishing diverse forms of socialist ownership.

Taking into account the experience which has been accumulated, a new law on the socialist enterprise will be adopted. It will open up wide possibilities for economic independence and for displaying initiative and enterprise. It will create equal conditions of economic operation for state and cooperative enterprises.

The laws on republican and regional financial autonomy, and on the local economy and self-management, will be of major political and economic significance. This is an important step along the road to the real consolidation of republics' sovereignty and to the expansion of local soviets' rights.

Fundamental decisions on the transformation of the Soviet federation will be made. Questions connected with nationalities policy which correspond to the principles and demands of perestroyka will be discussed in the near future, at a party Central Committee plenum. The CPSU's platform will, we hope, serve as a good basis for resolving questions of the Soviet federation, and for solving problems of interethnic relations. Other questions will be examined and resolved. In short, we have entered a responsible period in society's development and in the implementation of the perestroyka policy developed by the CPSU.

The changes that we have begun, which we are increasing, and which we are deepening, will undoubtedly produce results. Of that I am convinced. For this to happen, however, everyone must act resolutely and in agreement. Today as never before, we need the consolidation of all progressive forces. In this work the role of the party, as the unifying vanguard force of society, is irreplaceable. Those who are counting on using the difficulties of the transition period for some unworthy goals, and who are attempting to undermine the party's influence, must know that this will not work.

We are certain that the working people, for all their critical attitude regarding various party committees' and communists' actions, well understand the significance of Lenin's party for the destiny of socialism, which is now inseparable from the success of perestroyka.

It is also obvious, however, that the new tasks call for a profound renewal of the party. By restructuring itself, by cleansing itself of all that hinders it, by overcoming dogmatism and conservatism, by mastering a new style and methods, by renewing the cadre composition, and by acting side by side with the working people, the CPSU will be able to fulfill its role as the political vanguard of society.

The CPSU will stick firmly to the restructuring line and stand at the head of the revolutionary transformations in the country. We must make a realistic assessment of all the processes and phenomena of the present situation, must display composure, see clearly where we stand, and not plunge into a state of confusion. On the basis of this we must draw conclusions for the work at the present moment and in the future. We must act in a responsible and sensible fashion, without deviating from the course that has been charted for the restructuring of society.

That is what I wanted to say to you, dear comrades, in this chat. [PRAVDA version omits previous sentence] I wish you all [PRAVDA version substitutes "dear comrades" for "all"] success in your undertakings, resoluteness, and fortitude of spirit! Thank you for your attention. [PRAVDA version omits final sentence]

Politburo Faults Officials on Goods Shortage

PM1109073589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

["At the CPSU Politburo Session"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] At an 8 September CPSU Central Committee Politburo meeting questions connected with the holding of a regular CPSU Central Committee Plenum were discussed. A decision was made to submit for the Central Committee plenum's consideration the questions of convoking the regular 28th CPSU Congress, and of the party's ethnic policy under contemporary conditions. It was noted that the CPSU's platform, which has been submitted for discussion by all the people, has given rise to lively interest and is being actively discussed in the labor collectives. It has met with support from party organizations and the broad masses of working people.

In the responses coming in to the CPSU Central Committee from different republics, the Soviet people are paying particular attention to the need to defend and strengthen the Soviet federation. There is a huge potential in this federation which enables it to tackle any questions of the sovereign development of the Soviet republics, of the extension of the rights of the autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and okrugs, and of the raising of their autonomy [samostoyatelnost] in all spheres of social, economic and spiritual life, with the close cooperation and mutual aid of the Soviet peoples.

The remarks and proposals arriving from the localities are being taken into account during the preparation of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Those attending the plenum will be handed the relevant materials.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo examined the question of the unsatisfactory provision of essential nonfood goods to the population. It was noted that a tense situation has arisen in the country over the provision of these goods to the population. This is giving rise to legitimate dissatisfaction among the workers, especially over interruptions in the sale of soap, washing powder, toothpaste, school exercise books, galvanic cells and batteries, and several other goods. The situation which evolved was the result of mistakes, red tape and an irresponsible attitude toward this business by the leaders of ministries, departments and enterprises, the permanent organs of the USSR Council of Ministers and the USSR State Planning Committee [gosplan].

The central committees of the communist parties of the union republics, the party kray and oblast committees, and the party committees of the USSR ministries and departments are not giving a principled assessment of the work of the communist leaders responsible for this stage of work, are reconciled to a delay in the time limits of housing construction and also to cases of cutting and reduction of factories in operation, including those producing goods of which there is an acute shortage.

It has been admitted that the communists—Comrade Gusev, V.K., deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for the Chemical and Timber Complex, Comrade Lakhtin, V.P., first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development, and Comrade A.Ya. Yefimov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan, have not taken sufficient measures for the steady provision of the population with everyday goods, and have weakened control of the state of the country's consumer market.

The Politburo has charged the Party Control Committee of the CPSU Central Committee to examine the question of party responsibility of the CPSU members Gusev, V.K., Lakhtin, V.P and communist leaders of USSR ministries and departments for disruptions permitted in the production of everyday items and unsatisfactory provision of them to the population.

A.Ya. Yefimov, member of the CPSU and deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, has been given a severe party reprimand. The Central Committee Politburo spoke of the impossibility of his continued tenure of the office he holds.

The USSR Council of Ministers was instructed to intensify supervision of fulfillment of decisions that have been made on developing the production of consumer goods and stepping up the saturation of the consumer market with them.

The party committees of republics, krays, oblasts, ministries and departments were instructed to raise the responsibility of communist leaders of local soviet and economic bodies for overcoming the deficit in essential goods as quickly as possible.

The Politburo heard a report from V.V. Nikitin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers for Food Supplies and Procurements, on work being carried out to supply the country's population with foodstuffs. During the discussion it was stressed that it is essential to intensify organizational work in completing the harvest and fodder procurements, and on carrying out state orders for the sale of grain, sugar beets, oil crops, and other crops. Particular attention has to be devoted to securing targets for supplies to all-union stocks and for the local supply of meat and dairy products, fruit and vegetable output, and potatoes.

Party committees and organizations were instructed to raise the level of their demands on the leading cadres responsible for specific areas in food supplies.

The session examined progress in fulfilling the program for the construction of facilities in the social sphere in the RSFSR in 1989.

It was noted that the speed of putting residential blocks into use has improved in the last 3 years. This has made it possible to improve the housing conditions of 5.7 million families. At the same time the scales of social construction are lagging behind requirements, and the number of those needing housing is not getting any smaller. The situation is exacerbated by the fact that in the 8 months of this year in the republic, a lowering of the volumes of commissioning residential blocks, schools, preschool establishments, hospitals, and clinics built from state capital investments has been allowed.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo noted that the heads of the construction ministries of the RSFSR, and also of many soviet and economic bodies, have not become genuine organizers of the fulfillment of the housing program. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo demanded that the state of affairs in construction sites of the social sphere should change, and that the responsibility of soviet and economic leaders for the unconditional fulfillment of the plans for housing and social and cultural construction should be raised. The heads of USSR gosplan and USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply should give the necessary help to solve questions of financing and of material and technical supplies to these construction sites.

Ligachev Calls for Party Unity in Frunze Speech

PM1009150789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Unnamed TASS special correspondent report on speech delivered at undated Frunze conference by Ye. K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee: "Central Asia and Kazakhstan: Real Reserves of Food Supply"]

[Excerpt] Frunze, 8 Sep— [Passage omitted] Ye. K. Ligachev concluded:

The party elaborated the perestroyka policy. Soviet people associate the renewal of socialism with its strengthening and with the revelation of the tremendous potential enshrined in it.

But there are forces which understand perestroyka as something quite different. Namely: the eroding of socialism's foundations, the creation of private property, the development of elemental market forces and a multiparty system, and the destruction of political stability. They slander the CPSU, defame Communists and leaders, and engage in political demagoguery, but do nothing themselves to help overcome difficulties that have arisen. For them the worse things get, the better.

Yes, society and the party are undergoing perestroyka. There is no alternative to renewal. The problem of the party's unity, the ideological and organizational rallying of its ranks, and the strengthening of ties with the masses are now coming to the fore in this process. It is my profound conviction that this is now the most important political problem. Without the strengthening of party unity perestroyka will be derailed. Is it really permissible for certain Communists to fan interethnic strife and participate in gatherings of an antisocialist, nationalist hue?

Of course party unity is possible only on the basis of the broad democratization of internal party life, party discipline, and strict observance of the principle of democratic centralism and the requirements of the CPSU Statutes.

Much is being said now about compromises. At the same time, compromises frequently take the form of unscrupulousness, and a semblance of unity is created. Yes, compromises are necessary and useful, but what is most important is not to concede on the chief, basic component of our policy.

There have been acute interethnic clashes in the Central Asian region. This obliges oblast and republic party organizations to be extremely attentive to national questions, to take account of the interests of all nationalities and ethnic groups, and to display flexibility and principledness.

It is necessary to conduct constant explanatory work with people and make them aware that, unless there is interethnic concord and friendship of the peoples and efficient work in the economic sphere, at enterprises, in the fields, and in livestock units, the disintegration of the union of Soviet republics is inevitable.

Interethnic clashes strike a blow at every Soviet person's living standards—including the food supplies of the oblast, republic, and country. Interethnic clashes strike a blow at people's personal security. They demand: The socialist state and the central and local power organs must create all the necessary conditions for their citizens' calm and confident life.

The main areas of the party's work in resolving national problems are contained in the CPSU draft platform on this question.

The task of people's moral education and of eradicating bribe-taking, theft, and crimes of all kinds remains urgent for party organizations. These phenomena are tenacious, and the attitude toward them must be all the more intransigent.

Without conscious discipline and law and order there cannot be democracy or the orderly functioning of the national economy. Persistent, active work on fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee March Plenum decisions and improving Soviet people's food supplies is the concern of literally the whole country—both the countryside and the city.

Participating in the work of the seminar-conference were I.I. Skiba, head of the CPSU Central Committee Agrarian Department, and senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League Central Committee.

Scores 'Ethnic Clashes'

LD0809194489 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Politburo member Yegor Ligachev has said ethnic clashes are a blow on every Soviet person's living standards. Addressing the workers of an agroindustrial complex in Kirghizia's capital, Frunze, Ligachev said that ethnic clashes were also a blow on people's personal safety. He stressed that the socialist state, the central and local governing bodies must create all the necessary conditions for their citizens to live calmly and confidently. Guidelines on how to solve the ethnic problems figure in the draft platform of the Communist Party on the issue to be discussed at the forthcoming full-scale meeting.

Views Agro-Industrial Production

PM1009152189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Visit to Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic"]

[Text] Frunze, 9 Sep—During his stay in the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, examined the work of party organizations in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee March (1989) Plenum decisions together with the republic's leaders and Communists.

Sokulukskiy Rayon takes rightful pride in its masters of livestock raising, who obtain high milk yields. Ye.K. Ligachev took an interest in the forms of organizing and encouraging labor, emphasizing that primary production links must have real independence. The CPSU Central Committee secretary rated highly the work on improving the stockmen's working and living conditions.

During a visit to Alamedin Fur Association questions connected with the processing and full utilization of sheepskins were discussed. It was emphasized that hundreds of thousands of skins have until recently been wasted, and still do go to waste. These problems are of concern both to economic planners, who lose valuable raw materials, and to people who want to have warm fur coats and jackets and leather jackets. The association's leaders and workers have complained to the machine-building ministries and the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, which fail to provide the furriers with highly productive, reliable equipment.

A wish was expressed to engage more widely in the dressing of sheepskins on collective farms [kolkhozes], on state farms, and at consumer cooperative, local industrial, and consumer services enterprises. This will make it possible to make fuller use of raw materials, to get away from the state enterprises' monopoly on processing them, and to satisfy more quickly the public demand for scarce goods.

During his visit to Kantskiy Rayon's "Alga" Kolkhoz and Kara-Suyskiy Rayon's Frunze Kolkhoz the CPSU Central Committee secretary familiarized himself with the progress in constructing housing, schools, and internal farm roads and with the work of medical establishments and trade and consumer services enterprises.

At the interrayon base of Osh Oblast Union of Consumer Trade Cooperatives Ye.K. Ligachev familiarized himself with the work of the food-packing shop.

Meetings and talks with collectives in the agro-industrial complex, the progress in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee March Plenum decisions, and specialists' calculations showed that Kirghizia possesses the necessary potential for the maximum satisfaction of the population's food needs by means of its own production and for increasing food supplies to the all-union fund. The republic party organization and rural and urban working people have to do some thorough work on this task.

Ye.K. Ligachev had a warm meeting with party, labor, and war veterans. They shared observations on many questions of the life of our society and expressed a wish to keep more firmly to the course of perestroyka and the renewal of society, to strengthen party unity, and to wage a struggle against attempts to weaken socialism's foundations.

Ye.K. Ligachev visited the branch of the V.I. Lenin Central Museum and the M.V. Frunze Museum. He laid flowers at the memorial to V.I. Lenin in the republic's capital.

In numerous meetings and talks residents of the republic's cities and villages raised questions connected with interethnic relations and the state of labor discipline and public order in the country and in individual regions. Acute concern was voiced at the fact that certain central mass media frequently cover in a one-sided way our country's history and the present state of affairs in society. It was stated with indignation that individual Communists participate in formations of an antisocialist, nationalist hue.

Meets With Kirghiz Party Leader

LD0909200789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Text] During his stay in the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic, Comrade Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, together with the republic's leaders and with communists, examined the work of party organizations to fulfill the decisions of the March 1989 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

Meetings and conversations with collectives in the agro-industrial complex and calculations by specialists showed that Kirghizia possesses the potential to satisfy the population's foodstuff requirements through its own production, and to increase foodstuff deliveries to the all-union stocks.

Comrade Ligachev's conversation with party, labor, and war vererans, in which Comrade Masaliyev, first secretary of the Communist Party of Kirghizia Central Committee, took part, was a warm one. In numerous meetings and conversations, the inhabitants of the republic's towns and villages also raised questions connected with interethnic relations and with the state of labor discipline and public order in the country and in individual regions.

Yeltsin Plans 'Unofficial' U.S. Lecture Tour

PM0809152789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[UPI report under the "IZVESTIYA Teleprinter" rubric: "B. Yeltsin's Trip to the United States"]

[Text] B.N. Yeltsin is planning an "unofficial" visit to the United States.

This will be Yeltsin's first U.S. visit, scheduled for 9-23 September, and in the course of it he will deliver lectures on the topic of "The Boundaries of Soviet Democracy" in New York, Baltimore, Washington, Chicago, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, Indianapolis, Dallas, and Miami.

The precise program for the visit will be announced later this week, according to a spokeswoman of the program for Soviet-U.S. exchanges, based in San Francisco.

Strike Situation in Azerbaijan Highlighted

Strikers' Demands Outlined

PM1009182989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Baku: Anxious Days"]

[Text] Baku, 9 Sep—Evening Baku appears smart and festive from the height of the viewing area in the S.M. Kirov Highland Park of Culture. Neon advertisements shine brightly and mingle, and a clear dotted line of lights outlines the seaside promenade. There is a lot of traffic in Azneft Square. On the open-air stage of the philharmonic society a singer is singing an intricate Azerbaijani melody....

But in the morning the city appears quite different—anxious and guarded. The usual flow of public transport taking people to work is absent, and there is no crush at the plant entrances. The strike begun following a call from the Azerbaijan People's Front [APF] is into its 6th day.

The strikers are demanding recognition of the APF, the convening of an extraordinary session of the republic's Supreme Soviet, the adoption there of a declaration on its sovereignty, and the lifting of the curfew. The chief demand contained in APF documents is for the question of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast as an inalienable part of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic to be resolved as quickly as possible.

While the APF and the republic leadership are seeking ways to arrange a constructive political dialogue, the republic-wide strike has already caused palpable harm to the national economy. According to preliminary data, during the first 4 days of the strike alone Azerbaijani industry failed to produce output worth almost R130 million, including nonfood consumer goods worth more than R32 million. Since the beginning of the week 7,700 tonnes of steel pipes, 6,200 tonnes of rolled metal, 1,700 tonnes of steel, thousands of electric motors and air conditioners, and much besides have not been produced owing to production stoppages. The supply of basic foodstuffs to city residents is daily becoming more complicated. The Azerbaijan Railroad remains paralyzed, which threatens unpredictable consequences for the republic's economy.

The appeal to the capital's residents from Baku Soviet deputies published today by local newspapers sounded extremely timely. This strike, this document points out, has already gone beyond the question of Nagorno-Karabakh. We will not hide the fact that we are on the threshold of events which could have grave, catastrophic consequences. The time has come to end strikes which harm the republic's economy and complicate life for the population.

Petrochemical Situation 'Alarming'

PM1009184589 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Sep 89 p 3

[Special correspondents D. Melikov and E. Elyashev report: "Baku: Week of Strike"]

[Text] Baku—Last winter there were bonfires burning at night in Lenin Square. People brought firewood and food there. The people did not disperse, demanding that the fate of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast be determined. Now, according to the calendar, summer has ended. And once again there are rallies in the square organized, by the Azerbaijan People's Front—an informal organization with no official status.

The ideas of perestroyka have been perceived very approvingly in Azerbaijan. It was on these processes that the people pinned their hopes of a very real improvement in their well-being, of extricating the republic from the one-sided structure of industry and monocultures in agriculture, and of sharply raising the population's living standards. However, these hopes are not being realized. Perestroyka in Azerbaijan is clearly slipping—there are many reasons for this. And the situation with regard to Nagorno-Karabakh is far from the least of them. It is diverting both the people and the leadership of Azerbaijan away from resolving the priority tasks of reorganizing economic and social life in the republic. It lies like a heavy burden of moral dissatisfaction on the people's shoulders, and indecisiveness and the protracted nature of the conflict have led not to a drop in tension but, on the contrary, to its being fueled to a still greater extent.

In speaking of this, the rally participants have advanced demands connected with strengthening the republic's sovereignty and economic independence and resolving the question of Nagorno-Karabakh.

The national strike has been going on in Azerbaijan for approximately 1 week. It is difficult as yet to obtain objective information. The capital of Azerbaijan is leading a not quite normal life. There are huge lines for gasoline, and the situation in the food stores is strained.

According to rough estimates by the State Planning Committee, industry alone has already failed to produce output worth at least R120 million. Azerbaijan Railroad Chief E. Abdullayev has told us that more than 31,000 cars have accumulated on the railroad. Direct lossess total R3 million.

There is an alarming situation in Azerbaijan's petrochemical complex, and Baku's two largest oil refineries are virtually idle. The entire Sumgait petrochemical complex, which is closely linked with them, has fallen silent. At the Azerbaijan Pipe-Rolling Plant, a giant of metallurgy, there is a flicker of life only in open-hearth production, and Kirovabad and Nakhichevan enterprises are idle.

Despite contacts between representatives of the Azerbaijan People's Front and the republic leadership, mutual understanding has not been achieved. A Saturday evening rally will decide the question of ending or extending the strike.

Economy, Social Sphere Hit

PM1009183589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Correspondent A. Dzhalilov report: "Strike in Baku"]

[Text] Baku—The strike which began in Baku enterprises Monday is continuing.

In an interview granted to a correspondent of the republic news agency A. Azizbekov, chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, said, in particular:

"According to preliminary data, during the first 4 days of the strikes the republic's industry failed to produce output worth almost R130 million, including nonfood consumer goods worth more than R32 million...

"It is not difficult to calculate the direct loss from the strikes—it is already possible to say that it will run into hundreds of millions of rubles. But the indirect loss will be still greater. Everyone should think about this, for stoppages in the republic will occasion losses in the social sphere which will be difficult to make up, and far from everything is in order in our social sphere anyway."

And here is the published opinion of V. Ismaylov, acceptance and transfer worker at Kishly Station on the Azerbaijan Railroad: "We are serving our clients, but only those to whom are addressed medical supplies, flour, milk, sugar, rice, meat, and other perishable products and products of vital importance to the population. Dozens of such cars were unloaded during the first 3 days of the week. We are refusing to handle the rest until our demands for the approval of Azerbaijan's sovereign rights, for the abolition of the Special Administration Committee in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, and for recognition of the People's Front are met."

An extraordinary session of Baku City Soviet was held 8 Spetember to discuss the Baku City Soviet Executive Committee report on the fulfillment of the planned socioeconomic programs and the perestroyka of the structure and activity of subordinate organizations and services.

The session formed a Baku Soviet standing commission for interethnic relations and international education and set up an interim committee to combat crime in Baku City.

Railway Situation Viewed

NC1109091689 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0340 GMT 8 Sep 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The recent meetings and strikes in the republic have [words indistinct]. It can now be said that a number of (?negative) facts have emerged. Freight cars full of oil have been sitting on tracks for the past 4 days. (?Are there workers) on the railway cars? What measures are being taken so that work is resumed?

A KOMMUNIST correspondent interviewed Abdullayev, director of the Azerbaijan railways administration, and urged him to reply to these questions. The interview has been published on the front page of KOMMUNIST under the heading "Closed Tracks and Loaded Railway Cars."

Comrade Abdullayev said: More than 31,000 fully loaded railway cars were stranded when movement along the tracks was halted. I believe that there is no need to explain what this means. Everyone is aware that the strike harms not only the workers in our sector but all areas of the economy. What concerns us most is that freight cars loaded with provisions and foodstuffs are not reaching their destinations. A total of 128 freight cars loaded with perishable goods and another 512 freight cars loaded with other valuable products are unable to move. Furthermore, 86 [word indistinct] have yet to be unloaded.

The editorial office of the newspaper published a report that the strikers have agreed to allow the [word indistinct] and other valuable products to reach their destination.

Baku General Strike Continues

LD0809193489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] At first sight, Baku is living an ordinary, normal life. The city's transport, metro system, and food stores are working. The children are going to school. But the situation in the city is matched to a September heatwave, which is unprecedented in these localities.

For the 5th day a general strike is in progress. It was called by the Popular Front of Azerbaijan, an informal and unregistered organization. The strike bears a political rather than an economic character. The machine-building enterprises are empty. The major installations which process oil have stopped work, and already the Baku people are experiencing a shortage of gasoline. [video shows idle enterprises, idle railway scenes]

A particularly severe situation has been created on the railway, where 20,000 tonnes of national economic freight, including foodstuffs, have accumulated on the tracks. The enterprise of Sumgait, Nakhichevan, and other cities of the republic are not working. The overall losses during the first 4 days of the strike amount to approximately R70 million.

The passions and emotions that have accumulated in the hearts of Baku people over almost 20 months are pouring out not onto the main square of the city. Almost every 3 days, meetings take place here called by the informal groups. [video shows people in large square] What are those who have gathered demanding? First and foremost, irreproachable observance of the constitutions of the USSR and of Azerbaijan in connection with the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and surrounding it. As those who spoke noted, the decrees, decisions, and other acts of the republic are not being fulfilled in the autonomous oblast. The meeting resounded to demands to disband the Special Administration Committee and to hand over full totality of power over the NKAO to the republic, and for the Popular Front of Azerbaijan to be officially recognized.

Yes, these September days have turned out to be unprecedentedly hot for the people of Baku. Today they associate all their hopes with the upcoming extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic. But, for the meantime, tomorrow there will be another meeting of many thousands in the city's main square.

Baku Deputies Call for End to Strikes

NC0909061289 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0340 GMT 9 Sep 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The deputies of the Baku City People's Deputies Soviet have adopted an appeal to the residents of Baku during an extraordinary meeting of the soviet.

The appeal, which was published on the front pages of the newspapers today [9 September], said that the social and political situation in Baku is not improving. The establishments [words indistinct] transportation schedules have been disrupted, and (?lawless) activities of individuals who do not abide by Soviet laws have increased. [passage indistinct]

It is becoming difficult to supply significant provisions to city residents.

The deputies of the Baku City People's Deputies Soviet have examined all the incidents and make the following appeal to you: It is time to end the strikes, which are harming the republic's economy and making people's lives difficult. The army of workers employed in the city's establishments, factories, and [words indistinct].

We appeal to you once again: It is necessary to extend a hand to one another and [word indistinct] in order to save Azerbaijan from this tragic situation, which has also engulfed Baku. It is only through unity that the moral wounds of our republic will be bandaged. It is through unity that all our efforts and achievements can be more effective and [word indistinct].

Baku Rally Held

PM1009192589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Correspondent A. Dzhalilov report: "Baku: Dialogue Continues"]

[Text] A big rally, in which more than 400,000 people participated, was held in Baku's central square Saturday evening [9 September]. The rally took place under the slogan of the dialogue which has begun between the republic leadership and Azerbaijan People's Front [APF] representatives.

As was reported at the rally, points of contact have become apparent, although it is premature to speak of full mutual understanding. Enterprises are still on strike in Baku, Nakhichevan, Sumgait, and other republic cities. Striking railroad workers are holding up the reception and dispatch of freight trains.

The strikers' main demands are for the question of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] as an inalienable part of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] to be resolved, for the Special Administration Committee to be disbanded with a political assessment of its activity, for the curfew in Baku and other Azerbaijan regions to be lifted, and for official recognition of the APF.

A. Orudzhev, Azerbaijan SSR minister of justice, provided information on the continuing dangerously explosive situation in Nagorno-Karabakh.

A call for strict observance of public order and for people not to succumb to the provocations of people not involved in the Popular Front movement, who are sowing discord in the city, was again heard at the rally, and the concept of adherence to the ideas of internationalism and to the democratic processes occurring in the republic and in the country was emphasized.

V. Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the rally participants. He reported the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decision's to hold an extraordinary session of the republic Supreme Soviet 15 September and to invite representatives of the People's

Front to it. In addition to the Council of Ministers report on progress in realizing socioeconomic plans aimed at raising the living standards of the republic's population, questions of the situation in the Azerbaijan SSR's NKAO, of the Azerbaijan SSR's sovereignty and citizenship, of the republic's transfer to the principles of economic independence and self-management, and others have also been submitted for examination at the session.

Since the strikers' demands were not definitively realized, as APF Board Member E. Mamedov declared, it was announced that the strikes will continue. A proposal was submitted for a second time to invite the country's leaders to Baku to meet with the republic's working people.

The dialogue between People's Front representatives and the republic leadership is continuing.

More on Baku Rally

LD1009185289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1735 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Text] Baku, 10 Sep—A TASS special correspondent reports:

Those taking part in a mass meeting held here late in the evening of 9 September were unable to decide whether to end or to continue the republic-wide strike begun a week ago at the behest of the People's Front of Azerbaijan (PFA). It brought together hundreds of thousands of people on the square named after Lenin.

The leaders of the PFA, who spoke at the meeting, confirmed the demands they had set out earlier. Unfortunately, they neglected to mention that the stoppage of many industrial enterprises and the inactivity of railway transport had negatively affected the republic's economy and that further continuation of the strike was frought with irreversible consequences.

Viktor Polyanichko, second secretary of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan Central Committee, informed those taking part in the meeting about the meetings between the leadership of the republic and representatives of the PFA, at which the main demands of the strikers had been discussed. During the meetings, both sides' willingness to enter into a dialogue was noted. Viktor Polyanichko announced the decision of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic to hold an extraordinary tenth session of the republic's Supreme Soviet on 15 September. The speaker's call for an end to the strike and for the resumption of work at industrial and transport enterprises did not meet with the understanding of those at the meeting, who insist upon the immediate satisfaction of at least some of their demands.

The conditions for ending the strike will be discussed at a regular meeting between the leaders of the PFA and the leadership of the republic.

Not everyone in Baku agrees with the initiators of the strike.

I am not against meetings; many sensible and reasonable proposals are expressed during them, Sara Vezirova, USSR people's deputy and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Glasnost, Citizens' Rights and Appeals, writes in the BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY today, for example.

[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 10 September adds the following: "But it is necessary for there to be organization and awareness, especially among young people. One must not rouse passions—that does not help us. The bitter experience we have already acquired proves this.

"In particular, as far as the strikes are concerned, the USSR People's deputy came out unambiguously against them. The working class needs to work and help Karabakh, the whole republic, the whole of our people."]

People's Front Calls Off Strike

AU1109065889 Paris AFP in English 2345 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, Sept 11 (AFP) [dateline as received]—The nationalist Azerbaijan Popular Front has called off a week-long strike following the signing of an accord with the authorities in the Caucasian republic, a representative of the front said late Sunday [10 September].

An announcement was made on Azerbaijani television saying the industrial action, called to press Azerbaijani claims of sovereignty over the ethnic Armenian enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh, would cease on Monday.

The only exception would be "on the railway leading to Armenia", the representative, Leyla Yunusova, said.

Mrs. Yunusova said the front signed an agreement with the republic authorities that included official recognition of the movement and participation by its representatives in a special meeting of the local parliament on September 15.

The mainly Moslem population of Azerbaijan had largely observed the strike call by the front. Azerbaijan and neighbouring Armenia are in dispute over the status of Nagorno-Karabakh, inhabited mainly by Christian ethnic Armenians. The enclave is currently under direct administration from Moscow.

Under the agreement, whose details were broadcast on television, Mrs. Yunusova said, the front's representatives will be able to take part in the preparation of laws to be submitted to parliament.

Laws are in preparation in Azerbaijan concerning sovereignty, citizenship, economic autonomy and local elections. The Popular Front recommends following the example of the Estonian parliament which has proclaimed a right of veto over legislation emanating from

Moscow, particularly regarding any attempt at an imposed solution to the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh.

Mrs. Yunusova said a commission would be formed to examine legal action taken against Azeri militants who attended nationalist meetings last November. Some of the meetings were followed by anti-Armenian progroms.

Popular Front representatives on television condemned attacks on Armenians as "acts of hooliganism organised by enemies of the Azeri people" and said the Front was "open to all nationalities", Mrs. Yunusova said.

Rally Held at Stepanakert's Victory Square

NC1009091389 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 9 Aug 89

[Text] Thousands of Stepanakert residents participated in a rally at Victory Square. Serj Sarkisayn, member of the Popular Movement of Armenian-Artsakhian [Nagorno Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO] Unity's political council, opened the rally by pointing to the need to preserve the rhythm of work, to ignore provocations by Azerbaijan, and to consolidate the unity of the NKAO Ethnic Council and the people.

People of Artsakh, we all know that the situation in the oblast is explosive, said (Tamara Shvedova), head accountant of the NKAO (?commercial branch), in her speech. We also know that under these tense circumstances, the Azerbaijani people are preparing to send a peace appeal to us. What kind of peace are they talking about? In the [word indistinct] (?international) city of Baku, they are savagely killing Armenians and destroying their homes. Suddenly there is a peace appeal. As a Russian woman and the mother of two fatherless children, I believe that the Azerbaijanis clearly want to show their strength. What they want is a call for violence and not an appeal for peace. Be wise, people. Do not respond to provocations, emphasized (Tamara Shvedova).

In other addresses to the rally, composer Eduard Ghazaryants, director of the Komitas Music School in Stepanakert, and Robert Kocharyan, chairman of the Popular Movement of the Armenian- Artsakhian Unity's political council and a deputy of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, condemned the so-called peace appeal and pointed out that whoever uses force to set foot on our territory will be met with the appropriate response.

NKAO Council Appeals to UN Security Council

NC0909092989 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] The leadership of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] Ethnic Council, which was elected by the plenipotentiary representatives of 80 percent of the NKAO population, has appealed to the UN Security Council to safeguard the security of the Armenian inhabitants in the NKAO. On the basis of the second paragraph of the December 1948 UN declaration, each person has right to freedom rights and no one should be the victim of any discrimination. Each person has freedom of movement in his territory. The UN declaration has always been suppressed in the NKAO. But today it is an issue of the physical threat against the Armenian residents. Appeals to repeat the Sumgait genocide are being heard, and these are being supported by official circles in the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic. For many months the small Christian oblast populated by 150,000 has been facing extremely atrocious acts. Violence and regular massacres are taking place, and the residents are being deported. Despite the various appeals received by high-ranking (?organizations), our country's leadership is not taking decisive measures to ensure the security of the oblast's residents. We are appealing to you today asking you to do everything to safeguard the security of the Armenian residents of the NKAO and, if necessary, to go (?as far) as sending a contingent of a UN peacekeeping force. Tomorrow may be too late, points out the appeal by the NKAO Ethnic Council leadership.

NKAO Council Cables Armenia on 'Tense Situation'

NC0909090989 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] The leadership of the ethnic council of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autnomous Oblast [NKAO] has sent a cable to the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau informing it of the tense situation in the oblast.

The cable says that the recent reports on the violent measures being planned against the Armenian residents in the oblast have been confirmed. Armed groups in militia uniforms are acting unpredictably and going from Baku to Azerbaijani-inhabited villages. There is no assurance that the USSR interior ministry's forces stationed in the oblast can safeguard the residents' security. The special administration committee was unable to make the militia contingent, which arrived illegally, withdraw.

The ethnic council's leadership requests the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] internal ministry to immediately send the necessary forces to the NKAO to safeguard the security of the Armenian residents.

The same cable has been sent to the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers.

Armenia-Azerbaijan Transport Problems Viewed

LD0809174589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 8 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A complex situation has developed on the main transport routes between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Here is Yuriy Rostov:

[Rostov] The railway line linking Azerbaijan and Armenia is of enormous importance. Freight for the regions afflicted by the earthquake come along it. This railway line and the highway running parallel to it are also virtually the only source of supply for the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic of Azerbaijan and Megrinskiy rayon in Armenia. To stop trains and road traffic means to blockade those territories. The railway is also the main transport artery for Nagorno-Karabakh.

Leninakan, Armenia: Small residential buildings for victims of the earthquake are arriving from Azerbaijan in this condition. The houses could have been vandalized while they were still in Russia.

Nakhichevan, Azerbaijan: There have been cases where train drivers refused to pass through Megrinskigy rayon in Armenia. Trains stood idle for 10 days.

[being recording] [Unidentified man] Civilians—train drivers and assistants—were beaten up, the windows of a locomotive, a new one which we had only just received, were broken, and locomotives were wrecked: there was also an explosion—not just one, but two. We stopped driving through after the second explosion. Immediately after the earthquake, when the situation in Karabakh was most complex, we worked for 30 hours and sometimes for 35 hours: we didn't demand anything, we worked for them.

[Second man] For many years we lived on friendly terms with the Armenians! We didn't have any questions. So, who is guilty? Let the people who raised this question be punished for it. Why doesn't our government adopt any measures? [end recording]

[Rostov] The border between Nakhichevan and Megri; checkpoints on both territories. Road traffic is virtually blocked.

Megri, Armenia: The railway bed here has been covered with gravel. An attempt to blow up a railway bridge has just occurred.

(?Nivredy) An Azerbaijani village in Armenia. The harvest grown by the inhabitants—peaches and figs—is not being accepted by procurement offices. The harvest is rotting.

The line through Azerbaijan to Nagorno-Karabakh: A stone, the criminals' most frequent weapon, flies through the window of our carriage.

Nagorno-Karabakh, Stepanakert: The region with probably the most complex situation. Nevertheless, for a long time there were no stoppages on the railways. The railways are serviced by both Armenians and Azerbaijanis.

The road traffic situation is even more important here. Armenian passengers were travelling in the bus, which you can see now. [video shows an APC straddling a road; a stationary bus with bullet holes in the side and broken windows]

[Begin recording] [unidentified militia officer] The situation has been greatly exacerbated, particularly recently. Often, almost every day, our buses arrive smashed up. There are women and children sitting in these buses, and sometimes it is dreadful to look at them when we see them. [end recording]

[Rostov] There have also been such cases involving Azerbaijani transport.

Official Cited on Gasoline Shortage in Armenia

NC0909081089 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Text] For a few days now, car lines at gasoline stations in the republic have stretched for kilometers. How long will the gasoline crisis last? For an answer to this question, an ARMENPRES correspondent interviewed (Karlen Vartanyan), top director of the republic's (?raw materials department) and production and commerce center.

He said: First of all, I should say that we receive gasoline both from Azerbaijan and from a number of oil-producing centers in the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. During the first 6 months of this year, [words indistinct] and the entire quantity projected for the first 6 months was received and distributed on time. The (?problems) in gas distribution started in (?July) when we received only 31,000 tonnes of gas from the RSFSR instead of the foreseen 62,000 tonnes, and only 15,000 tonnes instead of 21,000 tonnes from Azerbaijan. The reason for this was that the railway was not functioning properly. Frankly speaking, the Azerbaijan [words indistinct] the cargoes of which are sent to Armenia, was not operating for almost 2 weeks. Because of the Azerbaijan [words indistinct]. Moreover, Baku's Lenin Refinery's output is also markedly low. The refinery's collective has sent cables to various party and republican organizations informing them that it is going to decrease its production markedly.

Our republic's leadership has appealed to party organizations to request that this issue be regulated. After the strikes in the Azerbaijan railway, the gas is being sent to our republic through the northern Caucasus [words indistinct] rail. This lengthens the road and [words indistinct] damages. A consignment of 57 wagons of gas destined for Armenia is now in the Northern Caucasus Rail Station. This consignment is to (?set off) on September (?15). We are doing everything in order to enable the casualty ward and (?hospital) cars to operate uninterruptedly. As for the [words indistinct] (?from Monday or Tuesday) [words indistinct].

Earthquakes Reported in Armenia, Buildings Damaged

NC0809180489 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1600 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Yerevan: An earthquake occurred in the (?January) zone of the December earthquake at 0346 Moscow time today [8 September]. The tremors at the epicenter of the earthquake, which was between Spitak and Kirovakan, measured 6 points. The residents of the other cities and rayons in the republic also felt the effects of the tremors. For example, the tremor measured 5 points in Kirovakan, 4.5 points in Stepanavan, 4 points in Razdan, and 3.5 points in Leninakan and (?Echivan).

A new earthquake occurred a short time after the first; that is, at 0411. The tremors at the epicenter of this earthquake, which occurred in the same area, measured 4 points.

Initial reports said that a number of buildings and installations have been damaged. There have been no casualties.

Lukyanov Speaks on Republics, Federation Renewal

LD1009165189 Moscow World Service in English 0210 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Text] [First announcer] The Soviet Union's first vice president Anatoliy Lukyanov replied to questions from Radio Moscow's reporter Vyacheslav Terekhov.

The first question is: The foreign press has been writing about the sharp ethnic conflict in this country; it interprets it as the beginning of the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, what's your opinion?

[Second announcer] Very complex processes are now taking place in our country, the vice president said. We believe that they will result in a stronger federation and not its collapse, not that it will become a confederation or some less stable form of community of nations. For a long time the relations between the republics seemed congealed, no one thought it necessary to improve them. What's more, after these relations had been inscribed in the constitution of 1936 the matter seemed settled for all time, but economic and political centralism grew stronger with the result that the republics and autonomous bodies gradually lost their self-government, independence became a mere formality, a thing without substance. Hence the process now taking shape in relations between the nations of this country actually constitute a renewal of the Soviet federation. It will be based primarily on a greater economic independence of the republics when they go over to regional cost accounting, self-sufficiency and stronger economic ties between the constituent republics, not only between these republics but between the other national territorial formations in the country as well. This will no doubt enable every republic to take into account its own special features when planning its economy, and that first. Secondly, the new national relations will be based on more precise demarcations of the powers possessed by the USSR, the autonomous republics and the other autonomous bodies. The USSR will have to relinquish some of its powers and allow the republics to make their own decisions on a whole number of questions. Third, the republics should have the final word in the matter of cultural relations. In no case should these three trends mean that we are going against the stream, against the main trend in world economy, that is, economic integration, broader cooperation between nations and nationalities. That is why all these processes do not indicate any weakening in our federations.

Alekseyev Cites Reaction to CPSU Baltics Statement

LD0909142689 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 9 TASS—By TASS commentator Lev Alekseyev:

The Soviet Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia continued discussing the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee's statement on the situation in the Soviet Baltic region.

Soviet people consider the statement in the general context of measures to normalise the situation in the sphere of ethnic relations and the CPSU's draft platform on the nationalities policy and on ways to strengthen economic and political sovereignty of republics within the Soviet Union.

People share the statement's concern over possible developments in the Baltic republics. The Central Committees of the Communist Parties of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia came up with serious conclusions and assessments in connection with the statement.

Today's PRAVDA publishes an interview with Lithuanian Communist Party leader Algirdas Brazauskas.

Commenting on the polarisation of public forces in the republic, he said: "Many people are united by ideas of renovating socialism and filling the republic's sovereignty with real content and by the irreconcilable attitude to outdated and ossified ideas.

"At the same time, some people try to sow seeds of alienation or drive a wedge between communists and non-party members, between the authorities and the people, between people of different nationalities."

Brazauskas said that the Lithuanian Communist Party favoured pluralism and self-determination of people on all vital issues on the basis of humanism, democracy and socialism, on the basis of profound awareness of historical responsibility for the destinies of Lithuania and the whole country.

Latvian Communist Party leader Jan Vagris spoke on republic television about the situation in Latvia and a possibility of acquiring a new, more independent status by its communist party.

"No doubt, our party will remain within the CPSU," he emphasised. A recent plenum of the Latvian Communist Party discussed the future status of the party.

Vagris said that Latvian communists were offered two options for consideration before their 25th congress, to be convened in a year.

In Tallinn, more than 1,000 secretaries of Estonian Communist Party organisations met to work out a common stand on the situation in Estonia.

The meeting marked the beginning of a discussion of the Estonian Communist Party's draft programme by republican party organisations.

Opening the meeting, Estonian Communist Party leader Vayno Vyalyas said that "one should not look in the statement for what divides the party or different platforms" and called for recognition of communists' common responsibility before the Communist Party of Estonia and the CPSU.

However, some public forces are trying to use the CPSU Central Committee's statement as a pretext for building up mutual mistrust or even hostility.

Some leaders of the Popular Fronts of Latvia and Estonia and the Lithuanian popular movement Sajudis claim in their "appeal to peoples of the Soviet Union" that the statement "makes an open attempt to sow suspicion of and hostility toward the three fraternal republics throughout the country and to evoke hatred for whole nations and movements."

Everyone, who reads the statement, can see that it contains no threats or ultimatums. On the contrary, it is imbued with respect for all peoples of the country and understanding of problems evoking their concern.

Complicated problems, which have accumulated over the years, can be solved only jointly and on the basis of mutual respect and complete equality.

Developments have recently taken a new turn in Lithuania. In Salcininkai, at the demand of a majority of local council deputies, the local council proclaimed the Salcininkai district a Polish autonomous district within Lithuania.

Poles, who make up a majority of the district's population, repeatedly asked the authorities to fully ensure their rights to preserve and develop their language and culture.

Of course, the council's decision has to be approved by superior bodies of power, but the move itself shows that Soviet citizens of various nationalities see their future in a union of equal nationalities and ethnic groups, whose rights would not be infringed on in any way.

The economic situation in a number of Baltic regions remains difficult.

In Tallinn, Estonian leaders and representatives of strike committees signed a protocol recording their positions.

The protocol announced that the Presidium of the Estonian Supreme Soviet will publish by October 1 the agenda of the Supreme Soviet's forthcoming session and proposals regarding the USSR Supreme Soviet's decree of August 16, 1989, which described some provisions of the Republic Law on elections to local councils as unconstitutional.

Baltic Statement 'Justified'

PM1009155189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Sep 89 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[TASS report: "Appeal To Improve the Situation"]

[Text] There is no end to the reactions reflecting the wide public response to the CPSU Central Committee statement on the situation in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. This document has been received with great attention by the broad Soviet public, representatives of the intelligentsia, mass movements and organizations, and by labor collectives. Soviet people view it in the general context of measures aimed at normalizing the situation in relations between the nationalities, of the draft platform of the CPSU that has been worked out by the party in the sphere of nationalities policy, and of strengthening the economic and political sovereignty of the republics within the framework of the union. In their reactions the people share alarm and concern over the development of events in the Baltic republics. Serious conclusions and assessments in connection with the statement have been made by the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Running through the reactions and the letters and telegrams from various regions of the country, including those from the Baltic republics, is the following thought: The CPSU Central Committee statement is justified. It reflects the complexity of the situation in these republics and has been dictated by responsibility for the fate of the people and for the prospects of perestroyka. It touches upon issues that disturb everyone who holds dear our common home, and who says a clear and firm no to separatism, extremism, and any manifestations of chauvinism and nationalism. It is also a serious warning to adventurist and anti-socialist forces, and at the same time a call to dialogue and cooperation in the interethnic sphere—a call that is calm, valid, and constructive.

"The CPSU Central Committee statement, 'On the Situation in the Baltic Republics,' written by Proshlyakov, Makatsariya, and their comrades, workers at the Ryazan Electronic Instruments production association, says that every republic is linked with others by thousands of links that are both economic and simply human ones and if they are broken at one stroke it will not make it any better for anyone. That is exactly so: We already feel this and think that ordinary workers in these republics do so too." That is also the view of workers at the Kishinev tractor works production association. "The CPSU Central Committee statement notes correctly that we will only be able to live better when we become the true masters not just of production but of the results of our labor. In order to achieve this it is essential to implement the economic reform that has been started in the country and to go over to republican financial autonomy. We will not achieve anything by dividing people according to ethnic considerations instead of assessing people according to their attitude to labor and the land upon which they live."

Overall the CPSU Central Committee statement has been received realistically abroad, too, in particular in the West. Ingvar Carlsson, the prime minister of Sweden, in an interview for Finland's Social Democrats' information agency, published in the Swedish newspaper SVENSKA DAGBLADET, stressed the need for a well-considered approach by the countries of Northern Europe with regard to the development of the situation in the Soviet Baltic republics. "I value the fact that the policy of glasnost has brought results. This would be impossible without the many initiatives of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Development continues to be in a very difficult stage and we must display caution and not draw hasty conclusions."

"The leaders of the nationalist movement in the Baltic republics should not overestimate the significance of their problems for the whole world," the DAILY TELEGRAPH observes unamibguously. Dealing with attitudes toward what is taking place in the Baltic republics, the same newspaper notes that the Soviet leadership is showing "tolerance toward the free expression of opinions and free political activity that has exceeded all expectations."

But probably the ideas set out in the CPSU Central Committee's statement and the interested and well-considered attitude toward it, including in the Baltic republics themselves, too, were not to everyone's liking. Some people perceived a danger in it, a danger to their own ambitions, to the line aimed at splitting the family of Soviet peoples. These people, who lay claim to the role of national prophets, try to use even the fact itself that such a document has made its appearance as grounds for again stirring up passions. They give numerous interviews; they organize all manner of letters and appeals; they contribute articles and commentaries that are distinguished by and have in common, first and foremost, one thing—a desire to distort the meaning and the spirit of the statement, to present it as a kind of ultimatum, and thereby lower its constructive effect upon the masses, and to shift the blame onto someone else.

"In our view, the CPSU Central Committee statement on the situation in the Soviet Baltic republics contains an overt attempt to sow suspicion and hostility toward the three fraternal republics, their indigenous populations throughout the country, and to generate a hatred of whole nations and movements." This is written by some leaders of the Popular Fronts of Latvia and Estonia, and of the Lithuanian 'Sajudis' in their "address to the peoples of the Soviet Union." A telegram addressed to Comrade Gorbachev by a group of USSR People's Deputies from Latvia speaks of "a threat to entire peoples."

Anyone who is familiar with the statement knows that it contains no threats or ultimata. Quite the reverse: it is imbued with respect for all the peoples of the Soviet Baltic region, with a sense of experiences shared, of responsibility, and with faith in their age-old wisdom.

Meanwhile, attempts are being made to represent the legitimate concern and the temperance of the assessments in the party document as diktat. Gayzhyunas, a senior lecturer at Vilnius University, writes in the newspaper TIESA: "When you read the text of the statement, you get the impression that there is a desire to burn bridges, to slam the door on dialogue, and to open the way to the law of the strong." True, the author immediately "warns" people who think the same way: "But we, too, must look around us; might our hotheads not provide food for the policy of the cudgel and the gunboat?"

Well, the heads are, indeed, sometimes "hot." Otherwise such fantasies could not arise in them.

At a rally held on 2 September in Vilnius, Landsbergis, one of Sajudis leaders, said that the order to have discord had supposedly come from above; that malice is being voiced from above, where the desire is to restore "Russian chauvinism against non-Russians"; "the prejudice of the Black Hundreds." [armed extremist, reactionary groups active in Russia in the early 1900's]

Professor Uosis, a member of the Sajudis Council, permitted himself an even more blasphemous statement, to the effect that the Soviet Union is an empire, and he appeals to the representatives of Russia to "cut out the malignant tumor."

This is coming from people who like to believe they are committed to civilized norms and humanity. And on account of his status as a USSR People's Deputy, one of them should surely have refrained from such dubious rhetoric.

The stereotyped nature of the negative reaction to the CPSU Central Committee statement puts one on one's guard. Its opponents are so alike in their interpretations and opinions expressed on the pages of some "front" newspapers, and in their utterances on television and radio—alike even in their vocabulary—that one cannot help being struck by the united and, moreover, very precise cut of these very "opinions." The center is being accused of destructive goals, which run counter to the thoughts and aspirations of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the desire to sway other peoples against them; the increasing of threats; the holding of an "unconstructive" position and an exclusively negative attitude toward the Popular Fronts, while hushing up many of the positive aspects of their work, and so on.

So one wants to exclaim: enough! Have they themselves read the text of the document? Even the first paragraphs mention the rapid growth of national self-awareness in the Baltic republics, thanks to which they have joined actively in the processes of deep reforms. But today it is to someone's advantage to strike out these words from the perception of the masses, just as it is to strike out the fact that a draft CPSU platform on the party's nationalities policy under present-day conditions has been submitted for discussion by all people. Yes, the problems of the Baltic republics' peoples, with their many nationalities, cannot be solved behind their backs. The statement therefore contains a specific appeal to the working people themselves, to the communists, to the people's deputies, and to all inhabitants of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—a call for them to enter into a dialogue and a joint search for compromise.

The statement serves to overcome the discord that has emerged and to strengthen trust between people of diverse nationalities. As for the warning, this was addressed not to the masses of the working people of these republics, not to the members of social democratic movements committed to perestroyka, but to those who kindle interethnic discord, to extremists, and to ultra-radicals of every hue.

The zealous critics of the CPSU Central Committee statement stubbornly fail to heed facts indicating that nationalist and sometimes simply hooligan elements are behaving in a provocative manner, poisoning the social atmosphere. These have been reported in the press. The people should, of course, in no event be blamed for these outbursts. Irresponsible extremists are not the people. Soviet people know and respect the age-old lofty moral reputation of their Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian brothers, who have always been distinguished by genuine goodneighborliness, and a steadfast memory grateful for good deeds. The people have nothing to do with all this. The overwhelming majority of the people, even in this dramatic period, is laboring honestly, laboring as a rule in internationalist collectives, is amicably disposed toward all other peoples, and is being creative, not destructive.

The statement is, of course, addressed not only to the peoples of the Baltic republics, but to all Soviet people. It is addressed to them precisely because in the consciousness of Soviet people, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are an inalienable part of our common socialist motherland. And the ills and problems of their citizens are our common problems. Provocative actions and destructive appeals of a nationalist and adventurist hue are indeed capable of breeding suspicion and casting a shadow on people's attitudes to one another.

As for allegations that the CPSU Central Committee statement is the fruit of some "games being played out in the apparat", that the statement is invalid since the Central Committee did not assemble to adopt it, and so on—what are these worth? Everyone familiar with the norms of party life knows that it is simply impossible to tackle all issues at plenums of the CPSU Central Committee alone; and the party rules provide for establishing permanent bodies of the CPSU Central Committee in order to carry out current work. It is clear that there is no violation of the party rules here.

How, all the same, can one explain the outburst of emotions and the attacks on the CPSU Central Committee statement? Why is the constructive content with which the document is imbued stubbornly ignored? Why, on the contrary, are things attributed to it which are not even hinted at in it? Well, most likely it is the same thing: Some leaders are trying at all costs to discredit the party's frank word, to weaken the force of that word's positive influence upon the minds of the working people, to make the meaning of the document unclear and to present it to people in a distorted form. They are ready to exploit any grounds in order to heat up the situation for their own political ambitions. Such a ruse long ago was accurately assessed as "trying to confuse the issue" [navodit ten na pleten].

It is important to keep returning directly to the text of the CPSU Central Committee statement. This states precisely and unambiguously: The only way to resolve the negative problems that have accumulated in the sphere of interethnic relations and free ourselves from the grievous errors of the past lies in working out a nationalities policy that meets the requirements and the spirit of perestroyka and new thinking; in further consolidating the principles of genuine financial autonomy and independence within the framework of a renewed union federation; in moving away from confrontation to dialogue, from emotions boiling over to common sense; and to search for solutions and compromises that are difficult but so necessary today.

Such is our common duty today to all the Soviet peoples and to the country.

Negative Reaction Criticized

LD0809173189 Moscow TASS in English 1723 GMT 8 Sep 89

["Mixed Response to Party Statement on Baltic Republics"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS—Comments on the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee statement on the situation in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia continue in a steady stream, reflecting the wide public response evoked by this document.

Soviet people view it in the general context of measures to normalise the situation in the field of interethnic relations and the draft party platform on nationalities policy.

One idea keynoting letters, telegrams and other comments from different parts of the country is that the Central Committee statement has been justified, that it mirrors the complexity of the situation in the three republics and has been dictated by a sense of responsibility for the fate of people and the prospects of perestroyka.

The statement has been received abroad, in particular in the West, on the whole realistically.

But its ideas and the interested, balanced attitude taken to it, in particular in the Baltic region itself, have gone against the grain of some people. They perceive it as a threat to their ambitions and their policy of splitting the family of Soviet nationalities.

These people, claiming the role of ethnic prophets, are now attempting to take advantage of even the statement itself to stir up passions, distort the document's meaning and spirit and misrepresent it as a kind of ultimatum.

The negative reaction to the statement is strangely stereotyped. Opponents are so similar in their interpretations and opinions, expressed in some of the Popular Fronts' newspapers, on television and radio, and even in their choice of words, that one involuntarily begins to think of a uniform and very precise carving of these opinions.

The centre is accused of destructive goals contradicting the aspirations of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, of a striving to set other peoples at odds with them, of a crescendo of threats, of a counter-constructive position, of a wholly negative attitude to popular fronts and of hushing up many positive aspects of their activities, among other charges.

The problems of peoples in the multinational Baltic region may not be solved behind their backs. This is why the statement specifically appealed to working people, Communists, people's deputies and all inhabitants of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia themselves to open dialogue and jointly search for compromises.

The warning made in the statement was addressed not to the working people of these republics and not to the members of mass democratic movements interested in perestroyka, but to those fomenting ethnic strife—to all manner of extremists and ultra-radicals.

The assiduous critics of the statement stubbornly ignore facts testifying to the defiant behavior of nationalist and hoodlum elements poisoning the social atmosphere.

Their outrages may not be blamed on the people by all means. Soviet people know and respect the traditionally high moral reputation of their brothers—Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians, who have always been distinguished by their genuine goodneighbourly attitudes and fine memories grateful for everything good done to them.

So how can the explosion of emotions and atacks on the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee statement be explained? Why is its thoroughly constructive substance being ignored, while something it didn't even say at all is being imputed to it?

The explanation is apparently that some leaders are keen to discredit the party's frank talking at all costs, weaken its positive influence on working people's minds, doctor the meaning of the statement and make people confused about it.

It is important to turn directly to the statement again and again. It says clearly and unequivocally: The only way to resolve accumulated negative problems in interethnic relations and repair the blunders of the past is by working out a nationalities policy meeting the requirements and spirit of perestroyka and new thinking, by affirming the principles of real cost-accounting and independence within the framework of an updated union federation, proceeding from confrontation to dialogue, and searching for elusive but badly needed solutions and compromises.

Latvian 'Workers Union' Holds First Congress

PM1109152789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[Own correspondent O. Meshkov report: "Constituent Congress"]

[Text] Riga, 9 Sep—It will come as a surprise to no one today that, in the era of democratization and plurality of opinions, the workers of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic have decided to set up their own organization too. The constituent congress of the Latvian Workers Union opened today at the Political Enlightenment Center in Riga.

Worker Dissatisfaction Expressed

LD1009194189 Moscow Domestic Service
in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Text] [Presenter] And now a few words about Latvia, where a constituent congress of a Union of Workers of the Republic has opened in Riga, the capital. This report from Ninel Meshkun, our correspondent in Riga, tells us what kind of organization this is and what tasks it sets itself:

[Meshkun] Its leaders claim that today they have more than 1,200 working people behind them and that the organization now has supporters at more than 100 industrial enterprises in the republic. The union is being set up as an alternative organization to existing trade unions, although in order to hold the congress it was necessary to turn to the self-same trade unions for material assistance. I have interviewed the new movement's leaders: The people with whom I am speaking are members of the union's organizing committee—(Karis Aleksandrovich Englikis), a bus driver; (Viktor Ivanovich Starovoytov) a metal-worker; (Valeriy Vyacheslavovich Piorov), a cooperative worker; and (Gennadiy Aleksandrovich Baryshev) a highways department electrician. What are the union's objectives?

[Begin recording] [unidentified speaker] To struggle for the workers' rights within the framework of the existing legislation.

[Meshkun] In what respects do you see these rights as being squeezed?

[Same speaker] The lack of rights of enterprise workers. The fact that there is no limit to their subordination to the administrative-command system.

[Meshkun] What are your complaints, your specific complaints, against the existing trade unions?

[Second unidentified speaker] The trade union has to work—and it doesn't work. It is not on the workers' side. It defends the rights of the administrative apparatus and the party apparatus, too, and the result of it is that the workers are feeding the administrative and bureaucratic apparatus: They themselves don't get anything, whereas actually the workers ought to participate in the profits.

[Meshkun] What is your attitude to the strikes?

[Third unidentified speaker] I am categorically opposed to them. I consider that today the working class has no interest in winning its rights with the help of strikes. But as a form of political struggle—we also mention this in our rules—we want to reserve these rights for ourselves as the ulimate means for getting our own way. But in the present situation, in Latvia, particularly, we are categorically opposed to that form of struggle. If today we really do unanimously adopt a decision that we will use strikes as a means of achieving our goals, then of course we will come out for that. I personally consider that we will not adopt that kind of decision today.

[Fourth unidentified speaker] I would permit myself to disagree with my colleague, because the strike as a form of struggle exists everywhere and it must do so because defending the workers' economic rights, which is why our trade union today is being set up, and that is what it declares...

[Meshkun interrupting] In fact your movement has been brought about by dissatisfaction with the country's economic situation, hasn't it? Do you have any specific, real, constructive proposals about how the country could be brought out of the economic crisis?

[First unidentified speaker] I consider that today, no doubt, one should put the question like this: For 4 years the workers have been following very carefuly the way in which events have been unfolding with perestroyka. We have heard how the party proposed it—and it cannot be denied that perestroyka does indeed originate from the party. We listened to the 27th congress. Then we waited patiently for the 19th party conference. And today all the formal and informal associations are taking their own decisions and creating concepts about how the country is to be brought out of the blind-alley and so on. But the workers, working at their workplace every day, have been waiting for 4 years, but excuse me, we in fact admit that there are no results. Therefore, I consider—and this is what the revolutionary nature of the present day amounts to—I consider that the working people are beginning to wake up, in the Donbass, and so on; and in Latvia, consequently we have also reached the conclusion that it is time for the worker to begin fulfilling in practice the tasks that the party declares. That is to say, it is time to begin the living work. [end recording]

[Meshkun] Essentially we are all witnessing the creation of independent trade unions, the role of which might turn out to be more than considerable. The Congress will adopt a program and the rules of the organization and will elect the leading body.

Riga Party Chief Interviewed

LD0809000189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1115 GMT 7 Sep 89

[Interview with Arnold Petrovich Klautsens, Riga city party committee first secretary, by correspondent Yuriy Gordeyev; date, place of interview not given; program begins in the middle of Klautsens speaking—live or recorded]

[Text] [Klautsens] ...The processes of perestroyka are proceeding in our republic with fairly big strides and a great deal has been done, perhaps more than in other regions of the country. First and foremost this applies to an increase in the self-awareness of the people, a reappraisal of the past. There has already been success and know-how in correcting a great deal, at least in mapping out the ways for correction. This is particularly true in the development of the Latvian language; the development of the national culture. Important measures have been adopted to improve the demographic situation in the republic, in particular in regard to the city of Riga. Much has been done to improve ecological problems.

You know, and probably all the listeners know, that our republic was the initiator among the three Baltic Republics of transfering as of the first of January next year to financial autonomy and self-management. This is a very important step and a great deal is expected of it by all the inhabitants of the republic, although it requires a great deal of work.

I think that important work has been done in terms of creative legislation, in the elaboration of new laws. Here our jurists are ahead of many regions of the country and they probably had an important influence, I believe, on the work, for example, of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies and on certain decisions which were adopted at the session of the Supreme Soviet. So a great deal has been done for perstroyka and much is being done.

But at the same time there is also a negative feature, negative processes, which exist in our republic and in other Baltic republics. These disturbing tendencies were noted very sharply in the 26 August statement by the CPSU Central Committee which was published in our press and which now serves as a cause for interpretation, for debates, for discussion.

[Gordeyev] Arnold Petrovich, when did this generally healthy development of perestroyka hit the rapids, so to speak? When did the stratification of society begin?

[Klautsens] Before we were not homogeneous. Perestroyka rocked all of society. The level of activity grew in all strata, in all categories of society, including in those which were displeased over something, offended by something, not satisfied with something. Perestroyka exposed these disagreements. We Communists in the party organization were not always able to see the tendencies and their consequences, in these processes. We were not able to keep ahead of them. We were often too late and this is probably one of the main reasons why certain problems have become exacerbated today in our republic and why the CPSU Central Committee was forced to talk about this with us in such a [word indistinct] way.

[Gordeyev] Arnold Petrovich, let's try to take a critical look at the main political movements which exist in the republic.

[Klautsens] The main ones are the People's Front of Latvia and the International Front of the Working People of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]—Interfront. I think that both movements formed during perestroyka as a manifestion of the activity of the masses. The indigenous Latvian population is for the most part concentrated in one of them—not 100 percent, but for the most part.

Fundamentally, members of the People's Front are driven by feelings of concern for the development of the republic, for solving those problems which have accumulated. But in my view not everything is unanimous here. People who were dissatisfied with something concerning Soviet power,—for example, the existing system—also joined [the Front] and sometimes they play a big role in the forming of public opinion in that movement, and determine certain actions.

What other name can you give, for example, to the 31 May 1989 decision of this People's Front, which calls for launching a discussion on how Latvia is to develop—outside of the USSR, or within the bounds of the Union. When the congress—a big congress—is underway in Moscow, when questions are being resolved on how to renew our federation and how the Union is to develop further—at such a complicated time of deep thought and searching for solutions, instead of thinking and proposing some kind of cardinal measures, namely on the development of the Union, a decision is made about possibly leaving the USSR.

Well, it's a tripping up, we'll put it that bluntly, of perestroyka. Of course this idea did not arise without a basis. It appeared under the influence of certain (?groups of) people, activists of the People's Front. As for the International Movement of the Working People of the Latvian SSR—this movement appeared soon after the creation of the People's Front.

Many consider it to be an alternative to the People's Front; an answer to those extremist statements and speeches which were heard at the Congress of the People's Front itself; a struggle against the encroachment upon the interests of the other section of the population in our republic. I think that at the basis of this movement there is also a sincere striving to find a way out of the situation in which the republic has found itself; to develop the economy; to resolve social and economic problems; to develop culture, and so on, and the people who are members of that movement are also interested in speeding up perestroyka, but there are also excesses in this movement. There are, to put it bluntly, people of a harsh turn of mind. There are elements of chauvinism in this movement.

The other movements, such as the movement for the universal independence of Latvia are more radical. This is a movement which has directly proclaimed the development of the republic outside the bounds of our country and, for example, at the meeting held on 23 August this year, after the Baltic Republics' chain of friendship, which everyone knows about, an unsanctioned meeting took place downtown. Speeches directly about this were heard there, openly proclaiming the development of the republic outside the bounds of the USSR, and more than that, speeches were heard calling for a settling of accounts with Communists and even the physical punishment of communists; and expressing distrust of both local leaders in the republic and in our center. There are also other movements of one orientation or another, but this one is the most characteristic.

[Gordeyev] Well since we have quickly agreed that the main forces are the Interfront [Interdvizheniye] and the People's Front, and since these two wings so far cannot come together at all the need obviously arises to talk about some kind of consolidating force which will help to find some sensible compromise which would help all of us to get out of the impasse.

[Klautsens] Yes. The situation has been reached where dialogue between these main movements is not taking place. This is mainly because the People's Front categorically refuses to conduct a dialogue with the Interfront. Moreover, because most of the mass media in the republic is under the great influence of the People's Front, thanks to this mass media the public perception of the Interfront is negative; it is an ugly duckling. Most of the mass media organs pursue this line consistently and persistently and the leadership of the People's Front does not believe there can be any kind of dialogue with this ugly duckling. In contrast the leadership of the Interfront has repeatedly proposed finding some kind of joint action.

[Gordeyev] One should probably bear in mind that with the growth of such a movement as the People's Front the role of the party—I wouldn't want to say that it has diminished—but it has become more difficult for the party to work.

[Klautsens] Of course the work has become more complicated. It has become more difficult, and fulfilling its role has become undoubtedly far more difficult. Probably, putting it bluntly, large numbers of people have joined these movements because they are not satisfied with the Communist Party and one of the reasons for the creation of the fronts is probably—and it is not just in our republic, in Latvia—a certain weakness, putting it mildly, in the Communist Parties correspondingly either [words indistinct] and so on. We understand the complexity and therefore one of the main directions in the work, for example, of the city party organizations (?can be seen). We have chosen and are already following this path to strengthen party ranks, to raise the role of the city party committee, the city party organization, as in every rayon committee and primary party organization. I'll say that the task is a difficult one, a complex one, but there's no other way.

Estonian Party Discusses Draft Action Program

PM0809145989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Leonid Levitskiy report: "Good Start for the Discussion"]

[Text] Tallinn—More than 1,000 secretaries of primary party organizations have met in Tallinn to work out an overall view of the situation in the republic and determine a strategy for action under these conditions. The general republic party discussion on the Estonian Communist Party draft program has started with this meeting.

"We should not look in this document for things that divide the party, various platforms," V. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, explained in his opening speech. "It should be our common goal to recognize honestly and in a comradely party-minded way the common responsibility facing the Estonian Communist Party and the CPSU."

The speeches by the party organization secretaries demonstrated a desire to find a common approach and avoid confrontation in their understanding of the main problems—the fundamental economic reform, the language laws, the local soviet elections, the administrative reform, and questions of interethnic relations. The republic party organization, they stressed, should have more autonomy and its own action program taking account of the actual situation in the republic. The Estonian Communist Party is now the only force capable of stabilizing society. The entire population—both native and Russian-speaking—wants to know the party's strategy and its approach to solving political, social, and economic problems. Without a clear program defining the actions of all party organizations it will not be possible to strengthen the Estonian Communist Party's unity—and that means its role and influence.

Discussion of the draft program continued in four sections—ideology, party organization, socioeconomic, and agrarian policy. Despite all the acuteness of the arguments the idea of achieving mutual understanding prevailed. And at the evening session the section leaders were able to report not only the results of the discussion but their overall joint proposals.

The discussion of the Estonian Communist Party program will be continued at rayon and city party organizations and, later, at an Estonian Communist Party Central Committee plenum.

Party Draft Program Released

LD1009161889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Text] The TASS correspondent sends this report from Tallinn. A draft program of action of the Communist Party of Estonia has been published in the republic's newspapers today. The seven sections of the draft assess the present situation in the republic and in the Communist Party of Estonia and the historic responsibility of the Communist Party for the past deformations. The main directions of perestroyka in the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] are mapped out; and the limits of independence of the Estonian Communist Party are defined. The decentralization of power and replacement of the unilateral command relations employed up to now with democracy suggest the same course of development within the party, the draft program says. The draft program is the result of many months' work by party and economic leaders and leading scientists of the republic. The draft is published on behalf of the working group of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee; its publication should start a broad discussion, and the Central Committee calls on not only Communists but all inhabitants of the Estonian SSR to take part in it.

Estonian Party Official on 'Nationalistic Tinge'

LD1009152589 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Text] Tallinn September 10 TASS—"The statement of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee prompted Estonian communists to think better of the processes taking place in the republic and was a concrete move to improve the political situation," V.A. Salluste, first secretary of the Lenin district party committee of Tallinn, told TASS.

There were unhealthy sentiments with a nationalistic tinge in Estonia, he went on to say. But this does not reflect ideas and aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the Estonian people backed by the decisions of the 15th plenary meeting of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee. The plenum declared unequivocally: The course of the Estonian Communist Party remains intact—for sovereign Estonia as a member of a qualitatively renewed soviet federation, and deeper perestroyka.

In his television speech Gorbachev stressed importance of pursuing the Leninist nationalities policy taking into account specific interests of each people, as well as strengthening sovereignty of union republics.

Estonian communists do not deny mistakes made, Salluste noted. "Today we close our ranks in the struggle with manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism. The discussion launched in the republic on a draft action programme of the Estonian Communist Party, published in the republican press, is aimed at achieving this purpose."

Here is opinion of a workingman, A. Konovalov, a city bus driver. "I did not participate in the recent strike which agitated the entire city," he said. "But I feel that such measures are not a way of settling urgent problems. I believe that the statement by the CPSU Central Committee which was approved by the greater part of the working people, is timely. The Popular Front of Estonia called on all citizens the other day not to speechify at rallies but to go to the countryside and help in harvesting. This is a correct decision. The situation should be brought back to normal. I think that the action programme of the Estonian Communist Party will help start a dialogue and reasonable action. [no close quotation mark as received]

Commemoration of Abwehr's Estonian Arm Hit

PM1109112989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Aug 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report on interview with Professor M. Raginskiy, in Moscow on 29 August under the general heading "Authorititive Opinion": "What Kind of Freedom Did 'Erna' Bring?"]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 29 August—"The recent unveiling of a monument to members of the espionage and sabotage group 'Erna' in the Estonian city of Kautla can only cause indignation and alarm," Professor M. Raginskiy, the famous Soviet lawyer and one of the USSR prosecutors at the Nuremberg trial, declares.

In an interview with a TASS correspondent he recalled that the "Erna" formation was created by the Abwehr, one of Hitlerite Germany's intelligence services, using emigre Estonians, before the beginning of the war with the USSR, in order to carry out espionage and subversive work on Estonian territory. [passage omitted]

Professor Raginskiy raised the point that the people promoting the immortalizing of "Erna's" deeds—among them were former members of the group—are trying to present "Erna" members as fighters for the "liberation of Estonia from the Reds and Stalinism," forgetting the real essence of their activities—carrying out the misanthropic policy of the Hitlerites.

"To follow their logic," the Soviet lawyer said, "the former head of the concentration camp in the Estonian city of Tartu, Karl Linnas, sentenced to death in his absence by the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Court and later deported from the United States to the USSR, where he subsequently died in prison, also deserves a memorial. The essence of the "struggles" waged by "Erna" and by Linnas is the same. It is based on a common hatred of Soviet power. Linnas just chose rather different methods: Although not participating directly in combat activity, he killed prisoners in the concentration camps, including old people, women, and children, and gave orders for the extermination of many thousands of people.

"The question arises: What kind of freedom were these people bringing to Estonia?" Mark Raginskiy stressed.

Lithuanians Reject Strike Call

PM1109092189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Sep 89 p 1

[Own correspondent V. Zarovskiy report under the rubric: "Every Day in this Column": "Leaflets and Strikes"]

[Text] The wave of strikes has reached Lithuania. Few people would have thought this possible. Rallies—yes, picketing—yes, all kind of declarations and statements—yes. But a strike...

The Vilnius "Zhalgiris" Machine Tool Building Plant was the first to take the plunge. After a rally on 5 September, 600 people decided to down tools. The others did not support them.

"I have worked here for 21 years," instrument-maker K. Statsevich said. "I think striking is wrong. Our section will continue to operate."

And it did. This metalworker's stance was backed by 1,100 of the plant's workers. Along with director Yu. Sivitskiy, the trade union committee chairman and party organization secretary were also opposed to a strike.

So this is the state of affairs. What brought it about?

The answer, it seems, is to be found in the leaflets. They were prepared 23 August 1989 by the committees for the political and social defense of the working people of Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] enterprises and organizations and the ideological commission of "Vienybe-Yedinstvo-Jednosc"—the republic council of the socialist movement for perestroyka in Lithuania. They are entitled: "Plan for Holding a Strike," "Instructions to the Striker," and "Duty of the Strike Committee." The document, in my opinion, deals with the mechanism of establishing power at enterprises. I read: "Pickets are to be mounted with a view to preventing outsiders' access to the enterprise," "Patrols are to be posted around the enterprise and in the area specified in advance by the republic strike committee to maintain public order, and subsequently also on the territory of the enterprise." And further on: **"Demonstrations and rallies, their timing, venues, and itineraries, as well as the strike itself do not require the authorization of the organs whose discriminatory policy the strikers are protesting."**

And lower down: "Demands for the removal and prosecution of the most inveterate offenders against peace, democracy, and socialism who promote ethnic inequality and who draft and apply unconstitutional laws are to be displayed on posters and banners." And the "Instructions" read: **"Remember, that the representatives of the political and economic authorities who have infringed your rights are unwilling to make even partial concessions. In order to force them to meet all demands, the strike must be effective—that is, general and protracted."**

The universal "handbook" for strike participants also makes provision for the right "to raise the question of the replacement of any adminstrative worker, or labor collective council, trade union committee, or party committee member at the enterprise." It also stipulates that "...as from the beginning of the strike all leadership at the enterprise is in the hands of the strike committee," and that "there is a normal opportunity for stepping up the struggle for these rights—namely a strike."

"A strike is, of course, a personal matter for every worker, but this relates to economic objectives," V. Merchaytis, head of the legal inspectorate of the Lithuanian Republic Trade Union Council, said in respect of the passages which we have just cited. "A political strike is illegal and we do not support it. It is not based on labor agreements. Strike committees do not have the right to make structural changes since the holding of elections to fill administrative posts is governed by the Law on the State Enterprise, and elections to fill trade union posts are governed by the general rules."

I have no intention of evaluating the sides' stances. After all, there is no law on strikes. Who can draw the line between legitimate and illegitimate demands. Between rights and obligations? Between common sense and obstinacy?

The aforementioned documents have appeared very recently. It could be said that they represent the dividing line between the interests of the representatives of the various nations living in the republic. And not only between them, but also among themselves. Last Saturday a rally organized by the Lithuanian Interethnic Coordination Association, the Workers Union of Lithuania, and the Women's Union of Lithuania was held at the Nagornyy Park, attended by representatives of all the national minorities living in Lithuania who took an active part. And on Sunday a rally of the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Power in Lithuania was held at the same venue which also brought together representatives of national minorities, albeit expounding totally different views.

Who will ultimately prove to have been right? I believe that it will be those who are urging calm and tolerance. Problems which have built up over decades can only be resolved through negotiation and mutual concessions. Confrontation only plays into the hands of those who want to kindle interethnic strife.

The package of the strikers' demands comprises 16 points, ranging from demands to repeal the latest legislative acts of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, to coopting workers onto the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. The package was drawn up on the instructions of working people of Lithuanian organizations and enterprises by the "Republic Committee for the Political and Social Defense of the Working People of Soviet Lithuania" 24 August. It also specifies the deadline by which these demands are to be met—4 September. The deadline has expired.

The strike at the "Zhalgiris" plant did not gain the support of other Vilnius enterprises. A meeting between the city leadership and the strikers has been held. A protocol was signed in accordance with which the strike is being suspended until a meeting between representatives of the strike committee and the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has taken place.

Official Views Lithuanian Deputies Letter

LD0809123589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0705 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Remarks by Anatoliy Pavlovich Orekhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities Committee for the Work of Soviets of Peoples Deputies, the Development of Government and Self- Government; date, place not given; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] My colleagues, USSR people's deputies of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, sent me this letter signed by 18 USSR people's deputies, where it is written that on 23 August this year the Baltic republics marked the 50th anniversary of the most sorrowful event in their history. At the same time as this letter, this booklet, 'USSR-Germany—1939', was sent. I have looked at this book. I examined the documents of those years contained in it, and to a certain extent I see that, on the whole, I was acquainted with these documents. At the time, well...[changes thought]

But the fact that today, in connection with the events of 1939-40, we are beginning to raise fundamental questions; we are conducting, a campaign is being waged over the question of the Baltic republics leaving the Soviet Union, whereas, as a whole, at the time the Seimas, after all, indeed passed this document. [sentence as heard] This is a legal document for joining the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

I am acquainted with the Chairman of the Riga City Executive Committee, Rubis Alfreds Petrovich. He is a very serious man, a Latvian. I have learned a great deal from him. He is a reasonable, experienced man. I sense how upset he is over the events taking place today in his native Latvia, as well as in Estonia and Lithuania. I feel that, looking at him, I know that many Latvians and Lithuanians do not support these extremist views. However, I see that today, for some reason, forces have surfaced which want to undermine our statehood and weaken our socialist system. It is necessary for us, however, today to pool our, well, to strengthen the friendship between all peoples in our country.

I am simply surprised that people's deputies, USSR people's deputies from the Lithuanian republic, signed this letter.

Brazauskas Discusses Hopes for Future

PM1009155789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[Interview in Vilnius with A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, by special correspondents Yu. Makhrin and N. Morozov: "Difficult Renewal"; date not given]

[Text] [Correspondents] How would you describe the sociopolitical situation in the republic today?

[Brazauskas] If I were to try to describe in one word the sociopolitical situation in our republic now, I could define it as complex. But light must, of course, be thrown on this concept. Otherwise it will be difficult to understand what I am talking about here.

When we maintain that the situation in the republic is complex, what we mean above all is that a polarization of social forces is in evidence here now. On the one hand, many people are united by the ideas of renewing socialism and filling the republic's sovereignty with real substance and by an uncompromising attitude toward everything obsolete and ossified. At the same time there are individual attempts to sow seeds of alienation or to drive a wedge between Communists and nonparty people, between representatives of power and the people, and between people of different nationalities.

We now live under conditions of real political pluralism, when the formation of different sociopolitical platforms is taking place in a stormy fashion. At the same time different groups and movements are seeking to influence people's minds and hearts, to make them take one side or the other and adopt corresponding value orientations.

The rapid growth of national self-awareness in our republic is widely known. It has embraced representatives of all nationalities, albeit not to an identical degree. We treat this with profound understanding.

Our position in the current sociopolitical situation in the republic may briefly be defined like this: We are for pluralism of opinions, for people's self-determination on all vitally important problems, but at the same time we also advocate that all this should take place on a basis of humanism, democracy, and socialism and be underpinned by profound awareness of the historic responsibility for the fate of Lithuania and the whole country.

[Correspondents] We have seen for ourselves that the CPSU Central Committee statement on the situation in the Baltic republics has been greeted ambivalently in Lithuania. In recent days you have visited many rayons, and the range of people's opinions has evidently come to light in conversations. What is this range?

[Brazauskas] I would like, first of all, to point out that the CPSU Central Committee statement is the center of attention for the republic's inhabitants. People are discussing this important document in a heated and interested manner. Probably none of our compatriots is indifferent to it. And this is good, because indifference, as is known, can wreck even the best initiatives.

Now about the range of opinions. You are right—this document has been greeted ambivalently in Lithuania. PRAVDA readers already know that the range of statements on this question is very wide—from total approval to total condemnation. The greatest misunderstanding or even irritation was aroused by individual harsh expressions contained in the statement. Objections were also elicited by the fact that this document makes an assessment of the situation in the Baltic region as a whole, although, as is known, the situation in each of the Baltic republics has many specific features.

Passions have still not died down over the CPSU Central Committee statement even now, although we have already done considerable work on explaining its essence. Still there is hope that the situation is being normalized. This is evidenced, above all, by the fact that more and more people are regarding this document as a serious warning to the leaders and peoples of the Baltic region that there exists a real threat to the success of our further advance.

[Correspondents] As the recent events at the "Zhalgiris" Machine Tool Building Plant showed, when workers in several shops were on the point of suspending work, there is a threat of political strikes in the republic. Is such an acute measure justified?

[Brazauskas] Proceeding from the political situation in Lithuania, in our opinion there are no grounds for strikes. The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, the republic's government, and the leadership of "Sajudis" are obliged to do everything to ensure that there are none.

We will continue to explain to people the pernicious nature of such actions because this is an extreme means of resolving political questions. It will merely create tremendous difficulties both for a strike's organizers and for those who participate in it. And life is difficult enough as it is...

We have people who for some reason wish to outstrip the natural course of society's development and endeavor all the time to outstrip events. And at once conflicts arise. In politics, we believe, it is necessary to take one step at a time, not several at once. Here, as in chess, it is necessary to think through every move. But now our society is so agitated and everyone is so excited that some people, without realizing it themselves, are running faster than events are developing. We pose the question like this: Let us stop and assess the course of events in other places—

among our neighbors, throughout the country. Finally, let us see and hear how others assess the processes taking place here. For sometimes things seem clearer from the side.

[Correspondents] An appeal for consolidation rather than confrontation among different public movements is being heard increasingly frequently at rallies. What is the republic Communist Party Central Committee doing to promote this?

[Brazauskas] Not an easy question: If it could be resolved easily, we probably would not have the situation that we have today. What are we doing? The Central Committee endeavors to explain to people and asks them to treat all phenomena very calmly and with understanding. This is the first point. We must seek a dialogue between individual national groups. The chief thing is to find points of contact on the nationalities question. And then we will resolve the political questions posed by both "Sajudis" and "Unity."

No one in Lithuania—neither the Supreme Soviet, nor the party authorities, nor, in the end, the public movements—intends to infringe the rights of any nation. It is necessary to find opportunities and ways for unification and common goals for further actions.

[Correspondents] Some 20 percent of Lithuania's population is nonindigenous. A minority! Who, if not the majority, should ensure the observance of that minority's rights. Is this not so?

[Brazauskas] The republic leadership considers it its duty to create all conditions for people of all nationalities living in Lithuania to have real opportunities to satisfy their cultural requirements and for full national self-expression.

The most heated arguments have been provoked by the granting of the status of state language to Lithuanian. A section of the population speaking other languages perceived that act as an infringement of its national rights. In actual fact, there is no infringement here. The proclamation of Lithuanian as the state language was a forced measure designed to halt the narrowing of its sphere of use and to create conditions for its normal development.

This measure accords with the most profound aspirations of the Lithuanian people, and many representatives of the population speaking other languages have gradually begun to understand this. I must also point out that knowledge of Lithuanian is required only for those persons who carry out leading work and maintain direct contacts with the population. In addition, it must be borne in mind that the law on language in no way affects the sphere of interpersonal relations.

Work is now being developed increasingly widely on creating conditions so that everyone who so wishes can master Lithuanian. For this a system of courses has been arranged, a special program is broadcast regularly on republic television, and teaching of Lithuanian has been stepped up in schools where schooling is in Russian and Polish. A material and technical base is gradually being laid down to ensure the normal functioning of official business. This is undoubtedly a complex question, and we will have to make much more effort to resolve it.

We advocate that people of all nationalities should be able to communicate freely in their native tongue and create cultural assets. We have already accumulated considerable experience of this, and we actively try to resolve the urgent questions that arise in this sphere jointly with representatives of cultural societies and associations uniting people of different nationalities—Russians, Poles, Jews, Belorussians, Karaim, Tatars and others.

We consider concern for the observance of the rights of national minorities a matter of principle and honor. So naturally we are offended when our efforts in this important matter are sometimes undervalued or denied altogether. And yet we are convinced that the truth will make headway.

[Correspondents] Two pluralistic formulas are used in discussions: "Strong center—strong republics" and "Strong republics—strong center." Which of them, in your view, accords more with the realities of life?

[Brazauskas] I believe that discussion of this question arises, above all, because the "center" concept is by no means always invested with identical substance. If what is understood by the "center" is the union ministries and departments whose work was long dominated by administrative-edict methods of leadership, then I would not support this. In addition, calls for centralization can hardly be considered justified when it is obvious that precisely the decentralization of socioeconomic and cultural development is opening up many good prospects.

Of course, all this does not speak in favor of the first formula, and it is hardly expedient to insist on it.

As is known, the draft CPSU platform "The Nationalities Policy of the Party Under Present Conditions" contains this formula: "Without a strong union there are no strong republics, and without strong republics there is no strong union." It essentially combines the two formulas that you cited.

[Correspondents] What do you, as an economist, expect from Lithuania's acquisition of economic independence?

[Brazauskas] In October the USSR Supreme Soviet session is to adopt the Law on the Economic Independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. However, our deputies will have to work properly.

I see no other way to improve the situation. On the other hand, economic reforms, even the most effective, cannot at once rectify matters in such a large country as the Soviet Union. In my view, this can be done faster and better in individual republics. However, even here it will take not one year or even two. All the same, it is a promising step that can produce positive results.

[Correspondents] The Lithuanian Communist Party today: What processes are taking place within it? How are the preparations going for the extraordinary Lithuanian Communist Party congress?

[Brazauskas] By decision of the 18th Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum we are now conducting a party discussion. And from its materials it is already possible to judge broadly what processes are taking place within our party organization. Many participants in the discussion have advocated a substantial increase in the Lithuanian Communist Party's independence and responsibility or, to put it briefly, a new status for it. This idea is now supported by many party organizations in the republic. And we intend to take the opinion of the majority very attentively into account.

Two ways of thinking have clashed during the discussion—the old one based on the stereotypes and assessments that took shape during the years of Stalinism and stagnation, and the new one based on the ideas and principles of perestroyka. It is gratifying that shoots of the new thinking increasingly predominate.

During the preparations for the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress we are drawing up draft program documents—the program and statutes of our Communist Party. They will soon be published for general discussion.

If we have decided to form a union of free and sovereign republics on new principles, then the party too must not ignore the possibilities of reforms. Many of our Communists advocate this. They pose the question like this: We must dissociate ourselves from the mistakes once made and from violations of Leninist principles and enhance the party's prestige in society.

The aim that we set ourselves in creating these documents is to substantially enhance the Lithuanian Communist Party's political role in the process of restructuring all spheres of social life in the republic and in ensuring Soviet Lithuania's real sovereignty.

[Correspondents] It is said that the future begins today. How do you see Lithuania's future?

[Brazauskas] It is always difficult to speak concretely about the future. Therefore I would like to draw in only its most general outline. The Lithuania of the future, as we imagine it now, is a sovereign, democratic, socialist state.

Speaking about this, certain people advance demands that are not at all considered and do not accord with the realities of our days. They simply do not think that the USSR—one of the mightiest states—is a guarantor of peace and stability. This stand of theirs is unacceptable to us. We favor a realistic approach, a clear vision of the specific situation. Therefore we approach with special responsibility the question of Lithuania's future. I undoubtedly see it in a qualitatively renewed federation of union republics.

The enhancement of the sovereignty of individual republics, as can already be clearly seen now, is inseparable from the changes that are occurring and will occur throughout the country. This is not a finished act but a continuous process, in the course of which the entire Soviet federation will undergo substantial changes. The very best conditions for Lithuania's full and independent development and for the upsurge of its economy and culture will be created at once.

In conclusion permit me, through your newspaper, to address its readers.

We have been deeply disturbed by the bitter words that have been addressed to the republic, its leadership, and various social formations from a number of places in our multinational country. Perestroyka really is proceeding with difficulty here, various curves have had to be negotiated in this process, and there are instances of irresponsible extremes. But we firmly believe in the people's mature good sense and self-control. I would very much like to hope that no one will cloud our mutual understanding or hamper the joint advance along the path of creating a new society.

Outlines Lithuania's Objectives

LD0809225989 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] In his traditional Friday interview to Lithuanian radio, the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, Algirdas Brazauskas, looked into the socio-political situation in Lithuania. He reiterated that no threat loomed over the Soviet power in Lithuania and no external forces were needed to defend it. Following the statement of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, proposals to help came from many parts of the Soviet Union. Algirdas Brazauskas believes that today Lithuania needs self-concentration, refrain from response to categorical assessments from outside, no wasting energy for incidental matters but instead concentration on basic objectives. Algirdas Brazauskas expressed confidence that if now the most radical forces and individuals repudiate two slogans—Secede from the Soviet Union, and Occupants, get out of Lithuania—the republic would achieve even more than it had planned.

Lithuanian Deputy Criticizes Lizichev

LD1109091889 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0000 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Report on interview with Romas Gudaitis, USSR people's deputy and member of the Sajudis Seimas Council, by correspondent Audrius Matonis; date, place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Matonis] Yesterday we announced that Army General Aleksey Lizichev, head of the Main Political

Administration of the Soviet Army and Navy, is currently on a visit to Lithuania. Today he met with the Central Committee secretaries and members of the Bureau of the Lithuanian Communist Party; later in the day he will meet with a group of people's deputies from Lithuania.

I talked to Romas Gudaitis, USSR people's deputy and member of the Seimas Council of the Sajudis restructuring movement, about this meeting:

[Gudaitis] I can only say that the USSR people's deputies from Lithuania found the meeting with Army General Lizichev rather disappointing. The burning question for all of us whether young Lithuanians would be able to do their military service on Lithuanian territory this year, that is, this fall, was given a negative answer.

We also rather sharply raised the issue of establishing a national military unit on Lithuanian territory. The reply to this question was also virtually negative. The auguments presented did not convince us.

It was argued that a great majority of Lithuanian young men would express their wish to serve in other branches of the armed forces, not in the ground forces; and only one division of ground forces could be formed in Lithuania as there are not enough Lithuanian officers. These arguments did not convince us. It seems that this issue is beyond the competence of Army General Lizichev. This is the position adopted by the supreme political authority of the USSR and by Gorbachev: National military formations on the territories of the republics should not be set up at present.

Another question causing us concern was the neutrality of the Army under the conditions of a tense politcal situation. We already have much evidence that Army officers—and especially those working in the political sphere—are taking part in various rallies and meetings where they give unambiguous support to the positions adopted by the Yedinstve movement. And what does that mean?

At one particular rally one of the high-ranking officers from the Vilnius garrison declared that the army was against the democratic processes taking place in Lithuania. We all understand what this statement implies, that behind these words was an unambiguous threat of military force.

Although this question was also raised rather sharply at the meeting, we did not receive a proper answer to it.

General Lizichev maintained during the talk that there had been provocative attempts to accuse the guards at military dislocation points. He even presented a specific instance when shots were fired in the Baltics in general.

Of course, we cannot agree that the facts presented are exactly true. However, one must bear in mind that that we do not need direct clashes at military units. There is no doubt that any incident could be used against us. Let us remember the events of 1940. Let us remember the tragic fate of Skucas and Povilaitis. The incident at that time was fabricated, blown out of all proportion, and transferred to the level of interstate relations and then used as a pretext to trample over the statehood of Lithuania.

This bitter historical lesson should be remembered again today in the conditions of a very tense political situation in Lithuania.

A number of other questions were also raised, but unfortunately, General Lizichev, who represents the military leadership of this country, did not give clearcut answers to the questions concerning essential issues.

The problem has only one solution: Our young men should do their military service in Lithuania, and a national Lithuanian division should be set up in the meantime within the structure of the Soviet Armed Forces. And certainly, our final objective is demilitarization of the Baltics and Lithuania while the withdrawal of Armed Forces from the territory of the Baltic states is our ultimate and the most sacred goal.

[Matonis] As is known, before meeting the group of the USSR peoples' deputies from Lithuania General Lizichev met the Bureau of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. Have you any idea what the results of the meeting were and in general what the talk was about?

[Gudaitis] I think the discussion was similar to the one we had. Facts were presented which illustrated the so-called national hysteria in Lithuania and the Baltic states. Perhaps the nature of the meeting was more of an ultimatum. Of course, there was benevolence in our conversation because General Lizichev is a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and he is obliged to speak to the deputies in a different tone than to the administration of the republic.

However, I think that principled decisions were not adopted at either of the meetings. This meeting did not bring any positive results.

[Matonis] And to end our conversation, could we make a prognosis concerning a crisis which seems to be ripening. I have in mind the intention of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet to adopt or at least to discuss the law which bans the forced deportation of Lithuanian citizens from the territory of Lithuania. This would be applied to Lithuanian young men who have to do military service.

Do you think General Lizichev's visit will have any effect on the intentions of the session or on their decisions?

[Gudaitis] I think that the present Supreme Soviet is yet not capable of adopting a suitable law. I think this is a matter for further democratic processes, however, we deputies from Lithuania will very sharply raise this question at the upcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow. There are like-minded people in, other republics. We can even use some regulations from the outdated Brezhnev constitution—which had compromised itself—to support our issue. First of all the regulation concerning the formal right of sovereign republics to secede from the USSR. I think we shall raise these issues rather sharply n Moscow. This would be the first stage.

Later, when the elections to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet are over and we have our own parliament, there is no doubt we shall solve these problems.

Sajudis Aide Remarks on Northern Territories Hit

PM0709153989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA PRESS SERVICE report: "Strange Desire"]

[Text] In an interview in the extreme right-wing Japanese newspaper SEKAI NIPPO USSR People's Deputy V. Landsbergis said in reply to the correspondent's question about "the possibility of any cooperation by 'Sajudis' in the matter of returning the 'northern territories' to Japan":

"We have a common aim and a common desire with the Japanese public organizations demanding the return of the 'northern territories.' It would be useful to act in cooperation. The USSR Government must know that it makes sense to end the occupation and return the territory."

V. Landsbergis' statement is of a tendentious nature. The author of the statement reveals his patent ignorance of the subject by speaking of "occupation." The Japanese side too, incidentally, must be aware of the unlawfulness of such terminology. At the end of the Japanese foreign minister's visit to the Soviet Union USSR Deputy Foreign Minister I.A. Rogachev said at a news conference that during the Soviet-Japanese talks in Moscow the Soviet side had set forth its stand on this question in a well-reasoned manner, using materials from Russian archives.

We believe, I.A. Rogachev declared, that these islands were discovered and opened up by Russians, and there is every reason to consider them primordially Russian, and now Soviet, territory.

Declaration of Polish Autonomy Viewed

LD0809122289 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0000 GMT 7 Sep 89

[Text] A session of the Rayon Council of People's Deputies took place in Salcininkai today. The session declared the Polish national autonomy in Salcininkai Rayon; 50 deputies voted for this proposal and 14 deputies voted against it.

Although it was known about the intentions to declare the autonomy, the decision of the session was somewhat surprising. A group of USSR people's deputies for Lithuania and also Vytautas Astrauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, visited Salcininkai Rayon, which is on the border with Belorussia, prior to the session. They met with the initiators of the autonomy and the people of the rayon. Attempts were made during the talks to find out the reasons for such a decision and they were urged to reconsider the idea.

Mecys Laurinkus, USSR people's deputy and member of the Seimas Council of the Lithuanian reform movement Sajudis, took part in the meetings. Here is what he had to say:

[Begin Laurinkus recording] The talks were rather sharp and a considerable number of complaints were made from both sides. During these meetings, both in Salcininkai with the above-mentioned initiators and with people in Eisiskes, it became clear that the problem was very serious indeed. Although convincing arguments of why this autonomy was needed have not been presented at any of the meetings, we became convinced that they were determined to go ahead, regardless of all the consequences, namely: deepening the political crisis in the republic and aggravating ethnic conflict. It is suspected that this is being done deliberately.

We tried hard to find out what reasons compelled them to do this. It appears that economic problems are the same there as they are in the rest of the republic. There are many complaints concerning the development of culture, namely, schools, the press, and the use of the language in offices. They themselves know perfectly well that since the law on state language was adopted there is no ban on the use of Polish or Russian, either in everyday life or in cultural activities. Of course, we could have a more flexible look at the language, but then their demands are very categorical and we are compelled to adopt a rather firm position on this question.

National minorities do exist and we have to defend their interests. However, to meet the demands which would introduce a division of united territory within a sovereign state is impossible.

Of course, this is what we said. [end recording]

As we can see, the arguments of the Lithuanian people's deputies were disregarded, as well as the verdict of the Lithuanian administration that such a declaration of autonomy was an anti- constitutional act. Immediately after the session I talked to Ceslovas Visockas, second secretary of the Salcininkai Rayon party committee.

When I asked him how he evaluated the declaration of autonomy, his answer was: normally. He said that there is no other for to solve the problems in the rayon. If the demands of the rayon are met—the status of the Lithuanian, Polish, and Russian languages are legalized, a Polish school of higher education is opened, and some other matters—then the autonomy could be cancelled.

Concluding our conversation, the second party secretary of the rayon said that the relationship of the autonomous administration of Salcininkai Rayon with the administration of the republic will continue to develop as hitherto. Apparently, nothing extraordinary has happened, he said.

Really?

Tomorrow we shall tell you about the position of the Lithuanian government on this issue.

Military Head Shuns Lithuanian Antidraft Leaflet

PM1109125189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Aug 89 First Edition p 1

[TASS report under the rubric "International Relations: We Follow Events" and the general heading "Do Not Play with People's Lives": "Lithuania: What Are the Extremists Aiming at?"]

[Text] Some unknown individuals have recently been distributing a leaflet among young people in the streets of some Lithuanian cities, addressed to the USSR minister of defense and the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic military commissar. Briefly, the contents of the leaflet say that, since the Lithuanian state is occupied by the Soviet Union, the citizens of the republic have the right to refuse to serve "in the occupation forces of the Soviet Union" and to return their military cards and certificates of registration on this basis.

Lieutenant General Ter-Grigoryants, deputy chief of the Ground Forces Main Directorate, comments on this on the request of a TASS correspondent.

I will begin by saying that this apology for a document is just a small link in the separatist line that destructive forces in the Baltic republics have been following recently. Their final aim is, of course, secession from the Soviet Union. A political evaluation of the activities of such nationalist and extremist groupings has been given with directness and responsibility in the CPSU Central Committee statement on the situation in the Soviet Baltic republics. I want to concentrate on the following things.

Literally a few weeks ago, all our people celebrated the 45th anniversary of the liberation of many Baltic cities and settlements, including Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania. The city, I will recall, was occupied by German fascist invaders on 24 June 1941 and liberated on 13 July 1944 by troops of the 3d Belorussian front. The latter date was celebrated in many corners of our immense Motherland also because, 40 years ago, representatives of almost all the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union fought and died at Vilnius. Thousands, if not tens of thousands of "killed in action" notices mentioning the capital and other Lithuanian settlements are still to be found in many Soviet families.

And so I wonder how it must seem to these people now to hear our Army being called an occupation army by some people in the Baltic states. This is also a direct insult to the whole Soviet people, who always saw the Army as their protector and helper. Finally, it is an insult to the patriotic feelings of the majority of young people who live in the Baltic republic and who have already served or are in the process of serving in the USSR Armed Forces. For them, I am convinced, the army was and continues to be a school for courage, patriotism, and physical and moral training.

Incidentally, I particularly want to stress that the spring draft in the Baltic republics went ahead quite efficiently and in an organized way, despite the complexity of the political situation in the region. Of course there were some individual shortcomings and errors but, on the whole, all the young men due to be drafted were indeed drafted and sent off to the army. According to unit commanders' reports, they are serving properly.

The draft campaign in the Baltic states, as in other regions of the country, particularly in the republics of the Transcaucasus and Central Asia, was distinctive in that the military commissariats paid particular attention to the social situation of future servicemen. When the young people were being sent off on service, the situation regarding their family and their means was taken into consideration as well as their parents' status and the state of affairs in their family. Many of them were left behind to serve in the Baltic Military District. Married draftees were given the possibility of carrying out their service in the place where they were drafted and where they lived. This will continue.

As can be seen, perestroyka has affected all spheres of Army life, even those that just a few years ago seemed immutable. For example, students from higher education establishments have returned from the Army ahead of schedule. But apparently extremist elements in the Baltic states know nothing of this and do not want to know. They are aiming for one thing: to drive a wedge between the people and the Army. To smear and discredit the Armed Forces in the eyes of society in every way, using young people for their selfish ends. Is this not obvious!

And what are they counting on here? On the basest and most selfish feelings of a specific section of young people, to whom high ideals mean nothing. They are not even worried by the fact that until recently those who did not serve in the army could not even count on capturing the attention of girls. These young men are afraid of difficulties in general and of the hardship of army service in particular. As a fellow human being, I even feel sorry for such people.

Finally, I cannot avoid mentioning that the young people who are led by the extremists show elementary legal illiteracy. After all, no one has repealed the USSR Law on Universal Military Service. And it clearly states that serving in the USSR Armed Forces is an honorable military duty and any attempts to evade it result in certain specific consequences. And the USSR Constitution states that protecting the socialist Fatherland is the sacred duty of every citizen of the USSR.

I would like to conclude by referring to the CPSU Central Committee's statement on the situation in the Soviet Baltic republics. It says in particular that serious danger is threatening the Baltic peoples' future. People should be aware of the abyss toward which the nationalist leaders are pushing them.

Let every citizen of the Baltic states who is handed an anonymous leaflet by extremists, as a true patriot, reflect on this warning.

Lithuanian Science Priorities Noted

LD0809130089 Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 4 May 89 p 3

[Article by Rimantas Kanapenas, chief, Laser Technology Section, Institute of Physics, Lithuanian Academy Of Sciences, entitled "Priority Directions In Lithuanian Science. What Are They?," under the rubric, "Problems In Economic Independence."]

[Excerpts] In practice, Lithuania possesses building materials only, but lacks the raw materials needed for other branches of industry. For this reason, we must develop those prioritized branches of science, that require intelligence, rather than materials. This should be also kept in mind, in planning Lithuania's industrial development, for the 21st century. It is imperative to prioritize not only the various branches of science, but also to establish priority in their relationship. [passage omitted] Attention must be given to scientific and technological, social, ecological and other problems, which are urgent not only for Lithuania, but also, for all ot the Soviet Union and ESPT the [? ecological, social, political and technical] system.

Lithuanian Republic Presidium of Associations For Scientific and Technical Creativity, proposes development, through use of the Republic budget, of the following prioritized directions: **Ecology**—problems of water, air and pollution reduction, soil erosion: methods and equipment for pollution measurement, creation of ecologically clean and waste free technologies; anticorrosive and galvanized protection; **Economy**—mechanisms for administration of economy and finance, strategy for economy branch development, new planning methods, and sociological problems, arising under new regional economic accountability and independence conditions; **Machine Study**—light [? mazagabariciu] highly accurate, electronically mechanized and lazer capable looms, requiring minimal metal, micro-ESM, electronic measurement devices, vibrator mechanisms, machine adaptive systems and establishment of micromodular complexes for loom and machine control; **Microelectronics**—super conductors, semi-conductors, dielectrical materials, with new physical properties, and the establishment of an elemental base for various electronic devices. **Information Science and Cybernetics**—counting systems for information processing and control of mathematical methods, and also a basic establishment for creation of new systems; **Laser Research**—problems in laser physics; for laser technology and technological science, industry, medicine, control of ecological pollution establishment; modification of surface materials through laser methods. **Energy** research of heat (perhaps also nuclear), water, wing and other types of energy improvement problems; **Biotechnics and Genetic Engineering** new quality controlled agricultural and animal husbandry selection methods; initiation of animal and poultry immuno-diagnostic methods; research of genetic mechanisms; evolution of new strains of flora and fauna, containing characteristics of use in our area. **Lithuanistics**—research in national language, literature, fine art, crafts and national history.

I think, these and other science directions, must be analyzed by Republic's institutes and, later, be put before all the scientists and introduced to the public. A Science and Technology Commission is needed, upon whose recommendation, the Republic State Planning Committee would distribute budgetary allowances for the solution of vital science and technology problems.

Foreign countries' experience demonstrates, the need for an initial investment of a large amount of capital. It brings an added return, in a relatively short time. Thus, our government, must also adequately finance our fundamental priority research. Applied research could be financed by economic accountability funds.

This type of financing "model" would be totally rational.

A directly opposite financing "model" is currently in existence. For instance, the Republic Academy of Sciences implements 17 complex union and 5 republic programs. The USSR State Science And Technology Committee, as well as the Republic, do not finance a single one of them. This is because the committee has handed the financing over to the union ministries and various departments and organizations, but the "peripheral" Academies of Science are to implement such programs unconditionally, through their own efforts and by utilizing their internal resources. If the "periphery" fails to implement these complex programs, the USSR Science and Technology Committee, will decrease the yearly allotment of budget funds designated for basic tasks.

This is how we have operated to date. It is necessary, however, to have each priority scientific task and each union and republic complex program, be financed by the state budget. Under this type of arrangement, scientific work results would become effective, quickly adaptable to production, profitable and practical.

In deliberating perspectives of scientific priorities, one should not forget the inventors' activity. It seems, we should have a separate Republic law to govern inventions. Thus, the Republic itself, rather than union departments, as is the case presently, could decide, where to sell the inventions, since those also, basically constitute a commodity. A local licensing service should also be established, to deal with patenting and the sale of inventions abroad.

A mandatory one, or two-year invention course should be instituted by higher schools, for upper class physics and technical specialty students. This would make it easier for physicists and engineers, working at scientific establishments, or in production, to "generate" new ideas, to formulate their claims to invention rights, for which there exist high scientific and technical, as well as, juridical demands.

Correction to 'Brazauskas on Postponement'

LD0309132389

The following correction pertains to 'Brazauskas on Postponement of Supreme Soviet Session' which appeared on page 58 of the 5 September Soviet Union DAILY REPORT:

Paragraph one, sentence three should read: "...statement of the all-union ministries and organizations which..." (changing 'members' to 'ministries')

Ukrainian People's Movement Congress Reported

Congress Opens 8 Sep

LD1109134489 Kiev in English to North America 2330 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] The constituent congress of the People's Movement of the Ukraine [PMU] began its work in Kiev today [8 September]. Taking part in it are more than 1,200 delegates from different regions of Ukraine.

But several delegations were banned from the sitting. This in particular concerned one of the two delegations from Odessa Oblast who, at their constituent regional conferences, could not arrive at an agreement on program issues and split, forming two factions.

Taking part in the work of the congress were representatives of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee, a number of ministries and organizations, and creative unions. Present at the congress are guests from other republics and from abroad. The work of the forum is being covered by almost 140 journalists, including foreign newsmen.

The congress was opened by chairman of the organizational committee, writer Volodymyr Yavorivskyy. The address to the delegates was delivered by Ukrainian writer Oles Honchar:

[Begin Honchar recording in Ukrainian fading to English translation] Assembled here, I believe, are not those who are guided by ambitions and some sort of ignoble goals. We hope that the speeches from this rostrum will contain the unbiased truth of life, its burning problems, lofty feelings of civic responsibility, the understanding of one's duty, and genuine concern for the destinies of perestroyka and our common future.

It is known that the party has healthy and constructive forces..but it also has no lack of people bent on careerism. There are such people who in appearance acknowledge the goals of perestroyka, but in reality give preference to yesterday. Our goal in common one—to build a law-ruled state. Only by joint efforts it will be possible to complete the restructuring of the country, by the efforts of people having different views, thoughts, temperaments, enlisted in consolidating the actions of all people capable of doing honest work—party members and the nonaffiliated, people of different nationalities and religions, all those who feel themselves masters of the country and strive to perfect it. [end recording]

Volodymyr Yavorivskyy made a speech about the activities of the organizational committee and the tasks faced by the PMU.

Economist Volodymyr Chernyak, Lvov scientist Myhkaylo Shvayka, Kiev lawyer Serhiy Holovatyy, poet Ivan Drach, and others also made program speeches.

Ukrainian poet Dmytro Pavlychko in part said the following:

[Begin Pavlychko recording in Ukrainian fading to English translation] We are not calling for the withdrawal from the Soviet Union, but for transformation of the USSR into a constellation of free states, of the nations united by their will. We hope to find support for our strivings and democratic ideals in the unity of actions with all Soviet peoples, first and foremost with Russians. We are well aware that nationalism and the Ukrainian nationalism as extreme reaction to chauvinistic oppressions is not able of suggesting anything to us, except a blind hatred and malice. We also understand that we are to live with the Russian people forever as good neighbors. Like before, the Ukrainian history will be connected with the Russian one in the future as well. But in our future context we would like to see not blood and hostility, but mutual assistance as was the frequent case on the level of (?contest) and friendship between representatives of our cultures.

The PMU, which includes not only Ukrainians but Russians, Jews, Poles, Belorussians, and representatives of other minorities in the republic can become a significant force in preventing a catastrophe of interethnic conflicts in Ukraine. [end recording]

Ukraine Party Chief Opposes Congress

AU0809140689 Paris AFP in English 1352 GMT 8 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, Sept 8 (AFP)—Ukraine nationalists convened in Kiev Friday for a founding congress, a spokesman for the group told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE here, a year after the creation of similar movements in the Baltic republics.

Nationalists were slow to organize the "Ukraine People's Movement for Perestroyka" because of the strong opposition of the Ukraine Communist Party boss, who was of the Brezhnev era, a leader of the organizing committee, Vyacheslav Chornovil, said here.

Members of the movement had been prepared to hold the constituent assembly in Lithuania if the authorities refused to allow them to meet in the Ukrainian capital, Mr. Chonovil said.

Ukrainian police forbade the movement from hanging the Ukrainian national flag from Kiev's Polytechnical Institute where the congress was being held.

But the yellow-and-yellow flags were being waved by some groups within the meeting hall, where 1,156 delegates and 500 guests, including representatives of the Ukrainian Communist Party, had gathered.

Representatives from Poland's Solidarity movement and from the Baltic nationalist movements were present, according to the head of the press center at the congress, Leonid Kornaukhov, a political commentator and communist party member.

The Ukrainian movement is backed by a group of local deputies to the Soviet parliament as well as the local Writers' Union.

The support of these groups forced the authorities to agree to permit the convening of a consituent congress, which more radical nationalists had been demanding for over a year, Mr. Chornovil said.

The congress was expected to last until Sunday and culminate in a rally and the placing of a wreath at the foot of a monument to the Ukrainian poet Tara Chevchenko.

Interethnic Relations Discussed

LD1109144989 Kiev in English to North America 2330 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Text] [Announcer] Today the constituent congress of the People's Movement of the Ukraine for Perestroyka, RUKH [as heard], continued its work in Kiev. Taking part in it are more than a thousand delegates from various regions of the Ukraine, and also representatives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, a number of ministries and state organizations, creative unions, guests from other republics, and from abroad.

The congress participants heard and discussed a report on the work done by the organizational committee, and the tasks of the RUKH, a number of program reports on economic, social, ecological, and other questions of social life; the problems of interethnic relations. Discussed were also certain aspects of the reform of the political system of the Ukraine; development of national culture.

A whole range of views, sometimes conflicting ones, have been expressed on ways of the further development of the society. Here is what People's Deputy of the USSR Sergiy Konev, a delegate from Dnepropetrovsk region, told in this connection:

[Begin Konev recording in Ukrainian fading to English translation] The entire historic experience proves that parliamentary reforms are the only serious and effective way of changing society. In this way we shall be honest before the people. Following this way we can achieve success in the realization of the program tasks of the people's movement. [end recording]

[Announcer] And now here's part of the speech to the [word indistinct] of the congress by the first secretary of the Podil district committee in Kiev of the communist Party of the Ukraine, (Ivan Zaliy):

[Begin (Zaliy) recording in Ukrainian fading to English translation] I would like to say a few words about the party and power. Being a Communist for 25 years, I'm not going to refuse to have anything to do with the party which suffered together with the entire nation and now pays tribute to the memory of the victims of the personality cult and stagnation. It feels responsible for a whole number of mistakes, but now it looks for the way towards truth, with the whole nation, towards good will and human dignity. The party knows that it must change itself. I believe that the problems of relations between the party and the public organizations will cease to exist. Together with the entire nation the communist party is today concerned about the fatal mistakes. Many party committees and separate organizations show their responsibility, and without waiting for instructions from the leading bodies, come out in support of perestroyka, democracy, and glasnost. The party stands for every person's dignity and human values common to all mankind. [end recording]

[Announcer] During a break in the work of the congress, Radio Kiev's reporter interviewed several delegates. At the microphone is Kiev scholar Vitaliy Donchyk, one of the founding members of the RUKH. Answering the question on the primary objectives of the movement to be achieved after the congress is over, Vitaliy Donchyk said the following:

[Begin Donchyk recording in Ukrainian fading to English translation] Now that we've penetrated into the depth of social life, when our program includes provisions of economy, ecology, human rights, society, and the state, nationalities issues, culture and language, we come to understand that these are closely interrelated problems which are to be solved immediately and all at once. We must do it together with the entire nation, with the people of various nationalities. After the congress is over various commissions will start functioning which will unite many enthusiasts, many clever people, who would start to elaborate the most pressing issues. As far as the movement is concerned, it needs everything: It needs a free, happy and sovereign Ukraine, which would be a happy place to live for Ukrainians and for the people of all other nationalities who live on its territory. [end recording]

[Announcer] Today the delegates heard the reports of the auditing commission, financial and editorial commissions; discussed and adopted the charter and the program of the RUKH.

Tomorrow the congress will continue its work.

Speakers Urge 'Political Sovereignty'

AU0909161089 Paris AFP in English 1532 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Report by Sophie Shihab: New Movement Challenges Communist Old Guard in Ukraine]

[Text] Moscow, Sept 9 (AFP)—The newly-formed Ukraine People's Movement for Perestroika is the first local opposition movement to win official—albeit reluctant—recognition from the Ukrainian Communist Party still dominated by the conservative old guard.

Participants at the movement's founding congress in Kiev, now in its second day, made no secret of their intention to challenge the supremacy of the anti-reform lobby in the Soviet Union's second most populous republic.

"We proclaim that Ukraine is no longer the fief of the forces of stagnation"—the standard adjective for officials of the Brezhnev era who fail to show enough zeal for reform—shouted one participant quoted by Soviet television.

Speakers called for "political sovereignty" for Ukraine and applauded guest Polish speaker Adam Michnik, of the Solidarity trade union who emphasised the importance for the Soviet Union of recent political developments in Poland, the congress press officers said, contacted by telephone.

Almost to the end, local newspapers campaigned against the new movement, known as Rukh in the Ukrainian language. But in an apparent volte-face, the new Communist Party boss of Kiev, Anatoly Kornienko, finally attended the congress.

The Ukrainian Communist Party First Secretary, Vladimir Shcherbitsky, refused to allow the congress proceedings to be broadcast live on Ukrainian radio and television. However Soviet national television showed pictures of the congress and of the stage decorated in blue and yellow, the Ukrainian national colours.

Congress sources on Saturday said participants had sent a telegram to the Ukrainian authorities protesting at a ban on the display of the Ukrainian flag outside the congress hall.

Earlier police had seized Ukrainian flags and arrested several people brandishing them in the crowd of young supporters outside the building, the sources said.

Nevertheless, the fact that police made no attempt to disperse the estimated 1,000 young people indicated "a turning point and a victory for democracy in Ukraine" said Ivan Guel, a representative of Ukrainian Catholics.

Demonstrations are in general banned in Ukraine. A recent meeting in the port of Simferopol was roughly dispersed by the police, according to a report Saturday in the youth daily Komsomolskaya Pravda.

The 1,200 congress delegates include members of all Ukrainian dissident groups although all are not represented in the leadership of the Popular Movement. The exclusion of some groups, notably the Helsinki Group, was one of the conditions imposed by the authorities in exchange for official recognition.

About 50 of the 326 Ukrainian deputies in the Soviet federal parliament joined a "club" of local "progressive" deputies who helped to convene the congress. One of them, writer Vladimir Yavoriski, is chairing the congress.

Reports read out Friday and Saturday were on themes such as "Rebirth of the Nation and inter-ethnic problems", "Ukrainians in the Gulag", the role of the Russians who make up one fifth of the 51 million inhabitants of Ukraine, economic affairs, ecology and other topics.

The agenda calls for "ecumenical prayers" to be said Saturday evening at the statue of Saint Vladimir and the congress was to wind up Sunday after the adoption of a manifesto and the election of the movement's leadership.

A rally is scheduled Sunday night at the monument to poet and national hero Taras Shevchenko. The participants had planned to march to the monument but the authorities ordered the march to be cancelled.

Congress Ends 10 Sep

LD1109084489 Kiev in Ukrainian to Europe 1700 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Excerpts] The founding congress of the People's Movement of Ukraine for Perestroyka ended its work today in Kiev [10 September]. Taking part in it were 1,109 delegates from various oblasts in the republic; guests from other republics, and from abroad. Representatives of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee, of a number of ministries, departments, public organizations, and creative unions attended the congress. The course of work was covered by a large group of journalists, including foreign journalists. [passage omitted]

The congress delegates adopted the statute and program of the People's Movement of Ukraine for Perestroyka, and a number of resolutions. Elections of leading bodies took place. Writer Ivan Drach was elected head of the People's Movement of Ukraine for Persetroyka.

Ukrainian Reactionary, Extremist Activity Hit

PM0809154989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Nikolay Baklanov report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Lawlessness Will Be Stopped"]

[Text] Kiev—It was noted at a routine coordination conference of Ukrainian law-enforcement agencies that in a number of the republic's oblasts, particularly Lvov, Ivano-Frankovsk, and Ternopol, and in Kiev there has recently been a sharp intensification of anticonstitutional activity by activists of various informal associations of a reactionary and extremist persuasion who use pro-perestroyka slogans as a blind, resort to gross violations of public order, and flout the law.

An official statement by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Prosecutor's Office and Ministry of Internal Affairs says that at unauthorized rallies, demonstrations, and processions they foment an anti-Soviet campaign and sow interethnic discord, making extensive use of nationalist symbols and emblems in the process, go in for direct confrontation with representatives of the authorities, insult militiamen and voluntary auxiliaries safeguarding public order, and try to cause disturbances.

In this regard the organs of the Prosecutor's Office and the Ministry of Internal Affairs at local level are instructed to use the full force of the law and the rights granted them to resolutely suppress any attempts to violate the law

Ukrainian Associate of Brezhnev Crticized

PM1109135989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Sep 89 First Edition p3

[Own correspondent M. Odinets dispatch under the rubric "From the Latest Mail": "Who Needs These Myths?"]

[Text] Kiev—Now and again, Ukrainian newspapers publish the memoirs of party and soviet workers and publicists about recent times, which have become sadly renowned as the period of stagnation. Just several days apart, VECHERNIY KIYEV and then KYYIVSKA PRAVDA carried a lengthy interview with P. Shelest, former first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, recorded by the historian D. Tabachnik. The item was accompanied with photographs, among which a picture of P. Shelest with L. Brezhnev stands out.

It is well known from the recollections of other memoir writers that Petr Yefimovich spoke out very strongly against N. Khrushchev at the CPSU Central Committee October (1964) Plenum and actively contributed to the elevation of L. Brezhnev to take his place. People in Kiev remember how, on his return from Moscow at that time, he addressed a meeting of the city's party aktiv and abused the head of party and state who had just been overthrown—the man whose praises he had sung until quite recently; they also remember the many sycophantic speeches he made in praise of L. Brezhnev, his faithful assurances, and his embraces, all of which were given shown in close-up by local television.

And now these interviews [plural as published] served up to readers. In them, N. Khrushchev comes across as a brilliant personality, a great friend of the Ukrainian people, and a supporter of P. Shelest's initiatives. And L. Brezhnev is painted in the blackest colors. He was "a man of limited intelligence, a chance, temporary, transitional figure." That is how he is described by his former comrade-in-arms, the first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. Well, it is an accurate description. And perhaps the interview tells how Petr Yefimovich raised objections, fought to ensure that this chance figure, having taken charge of our party and state, should not doom our country to stagnation, and stood up to the moral corruption of this man who grabbed every award going, to use the expression of the interviewee? No, you will find nothing of the sort in the material offered by the newspapers—it would, in fact, be inconceivable with the "Lenya-Petya" [reference to friendly familar forms of Brezhnev's and Shelest's names in talking to each other] system of relations. On the other hand, the author of the interview lavishly paints himself as a patron of culture in the republic and virtually the forerunner of restructuring.

However, people like P. Shelest were essentially the real pillars of the stagnation period, the buttress of the entire Brezhnev system. But now, publishing their memoirs, they are trying to portray themselves in a totally positive light.

If P. Shelest's memory failed him, the editorial boards of VECHERNIY KIYEV and KYYIVSKA PRAVDA should have tactfully corrected him and, at the same time, advised the interviewer, D. Tabachnik. But they did not do this, and so yet another myth is born before our eyes about an imaginary champion of restructuring who supposedly brought our renewal closer by his endeavors in the sixties. Only, whose hands do these myths play into? After all, intelligent people simply laugh at them.

Further Reportage on Moldavian Strike Situation

Strikes Over Language Law Continue

LD0809220189 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 8 Sep 89

[D. Kiselev report from Kishinev; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Kiselev] Signs and posters based on Latin script are beginning to appear on the streets of Kishinev. Such script is characteristic for all languages of the Romanian group, including the Moldavian language. This is the first thing which strikes the eye of visitors. This is the first, and a visible result of the laws about languages which were recently adopted in the republic. The first result, but is it the only one?

Yes, the strikers disagree with the transfer of the Moldavian language to Latin script. Yes, they want an identical status for the Moldavian and the Russian in the republic. But they also demand that the Popular Front be banned, because its activity, so they declare, may lead the republic the wrong way. It is not leading, but may lead it. Generally, it seems to us that the republican strike committee is largely protesting what has not yet come to pass. In other words, the protest bears, seemingly, a character of anticipation. One way or another, the strike in Tiraspol, Bendery and Komat continues. But the commission here is doing everything possible to stop it. Today, talks went on until 0400.

(Yerken Aviilbekov), chairman of the Supreme Soviet Commission, reported on this at a meeting with USSR people's deputies from Moldavia.

[Begin (Aviilbekov) recording] Unfortunately, we have gone back to that question several times. We have adjourned and studied it. And we did not come to a unanimous opinion. Therefore, no conciliatory document has been signed, and no decision has been made by the strike committee about ending the strike. All these talks have taken place in a calm atmosphere, in a businesslike atmosphere, without any offense, in a spirit of, I would say, mutual restraint and patience on all sides, without subjecting each other to accusations. [end recording]

[Kiselev] As for the language laws which were, if not the reason, at least the grounds for the strike, they will bring the republic, stage by stage, in the years to come, to real bilingualism. The laws have been elaborated in sufficient detail, and perhaps this is why they require fairly painstaking study. But time and explanatory work is needed for this. For the time being, misunderstandings arise. (Andrey Safonov), representative of Interdvizheniye, interviewed outside the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic, said that in Tiraspol, over 80 percent—about 90 percent—of the population there is Russian-speaking. But, in esence, Tiraspol is being told to introduce all documentation exclusively in the Moldavian language. (Andrey Safonov) interprets the situation:

[Begin (Safonov) recording] Here are the lines of the law. With regard for the demographical situation and the requirements of production, the business of production at enterprises, establishments and organizations, a list of which is determined by the Council of Ministers of the Moldavian SSR, may be conducted, at the proposal of the rayon and city soviets of people's deputies, also in the Russian or another acceptable language. [end recording]

Moldavian Party Issues Appeal

LD1009144789 Moscow TASS in English 1418 GMT 10 Sep 89

[Text] Kishinev September 10 ETA-TASS—The most pressing issues of the day in Moldavia are an end to strikes, a common sense assessment of the laws recently promulgated by the republican parliament and their enforcement aimed at ensuring equal rights and opportunities to all ethnic communities residing on its territory, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission Yerkin Auyelbekov said in televised address to the republican population.

The granting to Moldavian state language status has been met with approval in the republic. However, disputes continue about a number of provisions of the regulatory enactment concerning the functioning of other languages in Moldavia.

The first phase of the commission's work is over. Before returning to Moscow, it passed its conclusions and proposals over to the republican strike committee for discussion by work collectives.

Prior to the September session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, these conclusions and proposals will also be submitted to the commissions of the Council of Nationalities. The on-site monitoring of the developments will continue until the situation is fully normalized.

The commission sought a balanced view of differing approaches to the situation—its members visited industrial enterprises and farming districts, talked with the republican leaders, Moldavian parliamentarians, activists of unofficial public movements, including the Popular Front and the International Yedinstvo (Unity) Movement. An analysis was made of the numerous letters from Moldavia's working people. The conclusion the commission arrived at was as follows: There are opportunities for mutually acceptable decisions. There are no opponents of normalization in the republic. It is important to begin work to explain to people what the adopted laws provide for and sort out all approaches.

The Central Committee of the Moldavian Communist Party issued an appeal to striking industrial and office workers. It stressed that for all the good and peaceful intentions of strikers, the stoppages could not but complicate the social, political and economic situation in the republic.

The new laws may not be irreproachable, the appeal said, but it will take time and public effort to apply them properly.

Understanding the anxiety of the working people of the republic at the aggravation of the political situation, the escalation of nationalistic, chauvinistic and extremist activities, anti-Russian and anti-Moldavian pronouncements and other provocative calls, the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee is planning to hold in the near future a plenum of the republican Communist

Party Central Committee. The appeal stressed that it would identify concrete steps to stabilize the situation.

Supreme Soviet Commission Visits

PM0809150589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Svetlana Gamova report: "USSR Supreme Soviet Commission Working"]

[Text] Kishinev—The USSR Supreme Soviet commission which has come to Moldavia to study the sociopolitical situation in order to stabilize it is continuing its meetings with labor collectives and representatives of the public and of informal associations. The commission is also conducting a dialogue with the republic strike committee. It is analyzing the situation and seeking the causes that led to tension in the republic and ways to improve the situation.

At the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium the commission had talks with representatives of the mass media. The commission members conveyed to journalists the opinion heard in many labor collectives: the republic's newspapers, radio, and television express ambivalent opinions on the events taking place, frequently voice diametrically opposite views, and display a lack of objectivity.

The journalists participating in the meeting expressed their attitude toward the situation that has come about.

Different opinions were heard. Thus, the opinion was expressed that the law on language was not the primary cause of the strikes. The ground was prepared for them long ago, including by the informal associations' rallies held in Kishinev, at which, as is known, it was not only language slogans and appeals that were heard. At the same time certain journalists at the meeting also upheld this viewpoint: The situation is being complicated, they said, by the reluctance of the Russian-speaking population, primarily in the striking cities of Tiraspol, Bendery, and Rybnitsa, to bother to study Moldavian.

The opinion of members of the republic strike committee was also heard.

The meeting was attended by M. Snegur, chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, and I. Gutsu, secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee.

The USSR Supreme Soviet commission is continuing its work.

More On Commission's Work

PM1009185589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Sep 89 First Edition p 2

[Special correspondent A. Pasechnik report: "Step on a Difficult Path"]

[Text] Kishinev, 10 Sep—In the next few days machine tools will come to life at enterprises in Tiraspol, Bendery, and other Moldavian cities where workers and employees have been on strike for 3 weeks, responding in this way to the publication and adoption of the draft laws on languages. Today a republic strike committee session adopted a decision to appeal to the labor collectives participating in the political strike to begin a phased return to work—first of all in railroad transport, the processing industry, on the most important construction projects, and also in production facilities connected with reciprocal deliveries. As already reported, on the previous day, Saturday, the commission set up by the country's Supreme Soviet at the strikers' request to study the complex sociopolitical situation in Moldavia had completed its work.

Only the first stage of our work has been completed, commission head Ye. Auyelbekov and commission member S. Shuvalov elaborated in an interview given before leaving Kishinev. The materials of numerous meetings and talks with urban and rural working people, with public organizations and informal associations, and with the republic leadership are now being generalized and will be forwarded without delay for examination by the country's Supreme Soviet Presidium.

"We understand this," V. Rylyakov, secretary of the party committee of Tiraspol's "Elektromash" Plant and cochairman of the republic strike committee, told me yesterday after a session of the latter. "We share the acute alarm expressed in the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee appeal to the Communists, workers, and engineering and technical personnel of striking enterprises and organizations. It is a pity this alarm did not come about in Kishinev much earlier, when the people of Tiraspol held a 2-hour warning strike 16 August. Well, we are not the only ones who are gaining experience. We believe that the strike has achieved its aim. Whatever is said about them, the adopted language laws are still more democratic than the drafts envisaged. Moreover, at our suggestion, the country's Supreme Soviet will conduct a legal-political expert appraisal of these laws. The second point. We have drawn the attention of the entire public of the republic, and also of the country, to the more frequent nationalist and extremist manifestations in Moldavia and the attempts to kindle interethnic feuds. Finally, perhaps the most important circumstance, we have graphically demonstrated that the working class is emerging into the arena of active struggle for perestroyka and for the genuine democratization of society. On returning to our work places we will continue the political struggle to consolidate all healthy forces in society. As M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his television address yesterday, we will only overcome the difficulties together."

Kishinev Work Collectives End Strikes

LD1109143689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1343 GMT 11 Sep 89

[Text] Kishinev, 11 September, (TASS)—All the work collectives of major industrial enterprises in Kishinev, the capital of Moldavia (a Soviet republic in the southwestern USSR), which were recently on strike have resumed work.

"The first days of the stoppage of the major instrument-making and electronic enterprises demonstrated that the strikes hit the workers themselves in the pocket," Petr Zhuravlev, cochairman of Kishinev strike committee, told a TASS correspondent. The strikers sought to draw the public's attention and the attention of the USSR and Moldavian Supreme Soviets to the demands of the Russian-speaking population of the republic. It is now, Petr Zhuravlev noted, that is is essential to find other methods to satisfy the interests of this population. He is convinced that this can only be achieved by means of a sensible compromise. "Strike committees remain at all enterprises."

"Their representatives are now conducting explanatory work among the labor collectives, persuading people that after the completion of the first stage of work in Moldavia of the commission of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, strikes in the present conditions have stopped being a method to solve thorny issues," said Petr Zhuravlev.

He stressed that it is essential to maintain the political activeness of the workers, who, according to him, have now realized clearly that they need to give their votes in the elections to the local bodies of power to those who will be able to defend their interests.

In the towns of Tiraspol, Bendery, Rybnitsa, and Komrat the situation has not changed. The appeal by the Commission of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Moldavia for an end to the strikes has not found support among the strikers. The enterprises and organizations of these towns are continuing their strike, considering that the laws adopted by the Supreme Soviet of Moldavia on languages harm the rights of the Russian speaking population. The proposal by the republican strike committee in connection with the worsening situation on the Moldavian railway to go back to work at the biggest locomotive depot in the republic in the town of Bendery was not met with understanding by the work force. At a meeting held today the railwaymen decided to continue their strike.

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Session Begins 29 Aug

18001571 Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 Aug 89 p 2

[P. Rashkov report: "Moldavia: The Situation Worsens"]

[Text] Kishinev—Tiraspol—The work of the Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session starts today in Kishinev. A session that striking labor collectives in Tiraspol, Bender, Rybnytsa and a number of other cities in the republic are demanding be set back to a later date. What is the reason for such an unexpected turn of events?

"Literally a week before the session," says director of the Tiraspol experimental lithography plant Ye. Pushnyak, who is, incidentally, an inhabitant of Moldavia, "the final texts of the laws 'On the Status of the Official Language in the Moldavian SSR,' 'On the Function of Languages on the Territory of the Moldavian SSR,' and 'On the Return of the Moldavian Language to the Latin Script,' which differ significantly from those submitted for national debate in March of this year, were published. Just one detail. In the initial drafts it was a question of parity in bilingualism. The version submitted for discussion at the session did not contain this provision. And now, people in Tiraspol and in many other cities cannot agree with what the official organs in the republic are reporting, namely, that this present version was prepared giving due consideration to workers' letters and wishes.... The Russian-speaking population has been taking an active part in the discussion but its proposals were not reflected. Moreover, not long before publication of these drafts, the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary S. Grossu assured the people of Tiraspol at a plenum of the gorkom [city party committee] that in our city clerical business would, as before, be conducted as envisaged in the initial drafts, in Russian. This measure is extremely important for Tiraspol because 87 percent of the population is Russian-speaking. But, the assurance of the republic's top leader notwithstanding, this provision is absent from the draft laws."

Yesterday I visited many of the striking collectives in Tiraspol. Some 39 of the 45 major enterprises are closed. Only those that guarantee the life rhythm of the city and that process agricultural produce are operating. Most people with whom I spoke—from rank-and-file workers to enterprise managers—believe that the strike is by no means the best method to protect their political interests. Nevertheless, this is what the collectives have done.

"We were forced to act in this way," explains B. Shtafan, chairman of the Tiraspol United Council of Labor Collectives, which has now become a strike committee. "When it became clear that a draft law was being prepared that seriously infringes on the Russian-speaking population in the republic—and this is almost 1.5 million people—the labor collectives in Tiraspol and and number of other cities held a 2-hour warning strike on 16 August in order to get the attention of the republic leadership. There were no consequences. And when 5 days later the drafts were published in the press, with which it was difficult for us to agree, the strike started and quickly spread to many enterprises. Our chief demand is to postpone the session to a later date, because there is now no time to debate what we think are largely discriminatory drafts."

A. Manoylov, a vehicle operator brigade leader at the Tiraspoltrans Production Association, and also an inhabitant of Moldavia (his father is Moldavian, his mother Ukrainian), joins in the conversation: "Now the republic official organs and Moldavian radio and television are trying to depict the affair in such a way that our strike is a 'plot by the directors,' economic sabotage, and that the enterprise managers are prepared to use the strike to cover their own inability to organize production. But no director could bring to the city the kind of order that reigns here during the strike. And it is not advantageous for us: The enterprise, one of the best in the republic, has always operated on a stable basis. At the beginning of the year we switched to leasing, and under the conditions of leasing each hour of idleness affects first and foremost the workers. Nevertheless, we are on strike. We are striking because we do not believe the promises that the law adopted will not make our position worse. The more so since even before adoption of the law we have seen the start of linguistic discrimination. One of our trucks recently returned from Kishinev empty—they had refused to load it merely because neither the driver nor the dispatcher could speak Moldavian. We emphasize that we are in no way opposed to the desires of the Moldavian people to revive their own language and expand its sphere of use. But we are against infringements on the interests of other peoples."

Many hopes for stabilization of the situation in the republic were placed in 27 August, when in accordance with a decree of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium it was decided everywhere to hold meetings of the inhabitants in order to explain the essence of the draft laws. It was planned that deputies from the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet, scholars, and the creative intelligentsia would take part in those meetings. One such meeting also took place in Tiraspol.

"Unfortunately, no officials from the government organs took part," says chief of the specialist sanitation section Ya. Tsysin. "Even though on that day the chairman of the republic Council of Ministers I. Kalin was visiting Tiraspol he met only with the strike committee and enterprise leaders in the city, but he has nothing reassuring to say."

The same measure was implemented the day before yesterday in the Moldavian capital, although I would make bold to assert that none of the meetings of the inhabitants were called for by the republic government. This is what happened. A large national gathering was held in the city's main square (this is what its organizers—the leadership of the republic People's Front—called it), attended by hundreds of thousands of supporters of that movement. Many of them came from distant regions and villages on foot. At the same time the "Unity" movement held its own meeting in the light athletics school. That is, instead of a national gathering of the peoples of the republic there was a demarcation along national lines, which in no way promoted consolidation.

The chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium M. Snegur attended the meeting of the republic People's Front, and he once again expressed the official viewpoint outlined in the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree "On the Sociopolitical Situation in the Republic in Connection with the Publication of the Draft Laws on Language" issued the day before, condemning and simultaneously calling for a restrained, thoughtful, and realistic approach to the solution of debatable issues. And here also there appeared emissaries from the Baltic and other republics, who, speaking in Russian, a language, incidentally, in which they mainly made their statements directed against the Russian-speaking population, which helped to destabilize the situation even more....

I am writing these lines in the premises of the Tiraspol strike committee. Literally a few hundred meters away a meeting, thousands strong, that started this morning, still continues (despite the rainy weather). The decision of the Tiraspol people is to stand their ground if the session does not adopt laws that are acceptable to everyone.

I cannot support the strikers in everything, and I am not about to. But I also cannot agree with everything in the proposed drafts, even though I speak Moldavian tolerably well. I do not understand, for example, the article that even the language of interethnic dealings in the republic—not the official language, I repeat, but the language of interethnic dealings—will be only Moldavian. Does this sentence not immediately cancel out other articles in the law that protect the interests of the Russian-speaking population, because it gives the hotheads (and there are many of them in the republic) an a legal basis for virtually banning conversation in Russian in a number of public places?

The session takes place today. A very great deal depends on the political maturity of the people's deputies and their ability to adopt a well-considered decision that satisfies the multinational population in the republic.

Vorotnikov Interviewed on Russian Federation

PM0709115589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Sep 89 Second Edition pp 1, 3

["Interview with V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium," by V. Terekhov: "Russia Open to Perestroyka"; place and date of interview not given; a SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA footnote on page 1 reads: "Last week the Central Broadcasting to Foreign Countries News and Propaganda Main Editorial Office broadcast an interview with V.I. Vorotnikov, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium. The SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Editorial Office reprints it with certain abbreviations."]

[Text] [Terekhov] The first batch of questions covers your life and individual aspects of your career. Specifically, what caused your transfer from the office of first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers to diplomatic work?... Or: You replaced Medunov as first secretary of Krasnodar Kray party committee [kraykom] and spent a year there imposing order in the kray. The broad public knows very little about the results of your activity, and this gives rise to numerous questions.

Tell us about your family, about your children and grandchildren, do you get to see them often?

[Vorotnikov] I think that my life is in no way exceptional. It is typical of people from my generation. I was born in 1926 in a worker's family, my father worked as a lathe operator at the Voronezh Machine Building Plant. I lost my father early—he died in 1937.

[Terekhov] Did he die from an illness in 1937, or was he repressed?

[Vorotnikov] He died from an illness. I enrolled in the Voronezh Aviation Industry Technical College in 1940. But the war interrupted my studies, and I went to work as a fitter at the Dzerzhinskiy Locomotive Repairs Plant in Voronezh. The evacuation began soon afterwards, and I moved to Kuybyshev. I started work at the aviation plant there, and worked at that plant until 1960. I graduated from a technical college, and then from an institute. I progressed from worker to party organizer of the party Central Committee at that plant.

I then worked at the oblast party committee [obkom], was chief of the Defense Industry Department, party obkom secretary, and chairman of the Kuybyshev Oblast Soviet Executive Committee . I was elected first secretary of Voronezh party obkom in 1971, and was promoted to the office of first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers in 1975.

You asked how I became a diplomat? It is already 10 years since then, but to this day I have no idea who made this proposal or what the reasons behind it were. Everything was so simple: I was summoned to the Central Committee, first to the department and then to the secretary, at the time when Comrade Rusakov was in charge of questions of relations with socialist countries, and I was told that I had been recommended as ambassador to Cuba.

Of course, this prompted some natural questions—I had been totally uninvolved in diplomatic work, but I was told that the Central Committee had deemed it necessary to take this step. I was not summoned either to the Secretariat or to the Politburo. I was notified of an official decision. Afterwards I had a conversation with Kirilenko and Suslov. They both attributed my appointment to the need to strengthen ties with Cuba, the need to strengthen the embassy staff.

That was a very complex period. It was the time when Jimmy Carter was approaching the end of his presidency and Ronald Reagan was beginning. Incidentally, the U.S. attitude toward Cuba at that time was very negative, just as it is now. I must say that I found my work as ambassador to Cuba very useful.

I spent approximately 3 and ½ years at that job.... I had a conversation with Comrade Andropov in 1982 He asked me whether I wished to return to party work. I replied in the affirmative. I was prepared to work wherever the party Central Committee deemed it necessary to post me provided, of course, my level of knowledge, training, experience, and so on was suitable. I had a desire to get out of Moscow. If I were to analyze all my past work, I must say that I got the most satisfaction when I worked as first secretary of Voronezh party obkom. This work is very responsible, but at the same time it is fairly autonomous [samostoyatelnaya].

The question of posting me to Krasnodar came up during my conversation with Yuriy Vladimirovich [Andropov]. Even though I thought that I would be offered a different job. I was aware of the situation prevailing in Krasnodar, I knew that a maelstrom was developing around all those Krasnodar, Sochi, Gelendzhik, and other affairs. I also knew Medunov and his quirks, if I could use the expression. My answer was: If it's got to be Krasnodar, then Krasnodar it shall be.

That was in June or July 1982. Medunov was released from his job at a party kraykom plenum, and I was elected kraykom first secretary. I must say that, even though I did not work there for very long, just 1 year, that period of work in Krasnodar was tremendously instructive. The situation prevailing in the kray at that time was very tense. Corruption, bribery, and criminal actions all flourished there. Party officials, soviet officials, economic officials, and even people from the criminal world were entwined in that tangle. Even though all these abscesses and ulcers had started coming to light, these processes still continued to a certain extent even while I was there. These negative processes had really put down deep roots there.

I had to do a lot of work with cadres. I must say that, in general and at mid-level in particular, the kray had some very strong workers. The people living in the villages are highly skilled and they love the land. Love for the land and for peasant toil is in their blood. And that isn't just the case in the villages. Leaders of many enterprises, as well as foremen and skilled workers, have quite high standards. They provided the bulwark on which we relied in order to struggle against negative phenomena.

[Terekhov] Corruption had probably affected only the top echelon of power in the kray?

[Vorotnikov] I could say both the top and the mid-level echelon. Its network was so ramified that it is hard to name a sector or a sphere which it had not reached. There were manifestations of corruption in the trade network, in the construction industry, in agriculture, in architecture, in health care.... Bribes were mandatory for enrollment in education establishments. Of course, some people were up in arms over the measures which were taken. There were threats, blackmail attempts, anonymous letters....

[Terekhov] Did anyone attempt to bribe you?

[Vorotnikov] No. But there were other attempts to stop me. I recall people's amazement that the kraykom secretary used to walk to work without a bodyguard. And people everywhere—in the streets, in the corridors, and even in the elevator—used to stop me and hand me notes, letters, and requests to look into things. The reception of citizens was organized in such a fashion that people could say what was on their minds.

In those conditions, my main aim was to ensure that I did not go wrong with, what shall I say, drastic measures. In parallel with demandingness and principledness, it was also necessary to listen to what people had to say, to look into matters, not to act hastily so as not to accidentally injure innocent people. There were people who were falsely accused. There were also cases of honest people being falsely accused in order to deflect the blow and save others from the possible consequences of their criminal actions.

[Terekhov] Who helped you more, the KGB or the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD]?

[Vorotnikov] A new chief of the Internal Affairs Administration started work, and a new prosecutor was appointed just before my arrival in the kray. The Committee [KGB] was, of course, actively at work. And all the main major operations were invariably conducted with the committee's participation.

I must tell you that I received a lot of specific advice from Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov. I consulted him, and not just him. I maintained contacts with other comrades from the party Central Committee, with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. He was quite familiar with that region. He gave me a lot of useful advice: How best to organize the work in order to normalize as swiftly as possible the life of that very distinctive and really rich kray....

I worked for about a year in Krasnodar. I was then elected candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and then member of the Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

Now about my family. I married in Kuybyshev in 1951. My wife is a graduate of the Kuybyshev Medical Institute. She worked as a district physician, then as an epidemiologist. She has now retired on a pension.

I have two daughters. Olga, the elder, graduated from Voronezh University. She works here in Moscow, teaching in one of Moscow's higher education establishments, and has her own family. She has two sons, my grandsons. One is 14 years old, the other is 8 years old.

[Terekhov] And what is her specialized field?

[Vorotnikov] She teaches English language. She graduated from the Romance-Teutonic Philology Faculty.

My second daughter, Yelena, started her studies at Voronezh University and then, following my transfer to Moscow, she studied at and graduated from the Moscow Institute for Radio Engineering, Electronics, and Automation. She is an electronics industry engineer. She works in a science and production association here, in Moscow. She has a daughter and a son. The daughter is 5 years old, the son is 18 months old. So, I have three grandsons and a granddaughter. A large family, as you can see.

We live in harmony. They live separately with their own families. Generally speaking, this is better. This makes the meetings more joyful, as it were. We meet quite often. Both I and my wife have more than enough worries with the grandchildren and the children. In a nutshell, life goes on like in any other family. There are joys, there are also sorrows.

[Terekhov] For several years you were head of government, and are now president of Russia. What did you find the most complex, maybe even unpleasant, in this time and, on the other hand, what was a source of joy, what gave you the most satisfaction?

[Vorotnikov] It is hard to give a simple answer to this question. It seems to me that, by virtue of my character and my work experience, I am better suited for specific work, when life presents you with questions every day, when it poses problems which have to be resolved today or tomorrow and also need to be worked out in the long term. This demands active involvement by all who work with you, you must know the local situation, visit the outlying regions, visit enterprises; in short, you must have your finger on the pulse of life.

The pace of work is active now. Life dictates that this be so. Perestroyka and the economic and political reforms demand also great activeness by the Supreme Soviet. I continue to operate in such a way as to ensure that work does not become a purely mechanical activity by the apparatus, that it does not become confined to the four walls of an office, I try to pay local visits and get to feel the pulse of life.

I have only just returned from a long-distance trip. I visited Magadan Oblast, Chukotka, and Kamchatka, in other words Russia's most far-flung regions. Although the residents of Kamchatka believe that we are wrong, that Russia does not end in Kamchatka but begins there.

It is hard to name an oblast I have not visited, whose specific features and traits I have not studied. Without this it is impossible to evaluate various situations or make the correct decisions.

This is why I cannot answer your question about what grieved me and what pleased me. You know, life is so diverse that it is impossible to divide it into clear-cut periods, as it were. Over a day, and even an hour, you experience sadness and joy, you have pleasant moments and some very sad moments. But the paramount point is that we are now pursuing the process of perestroyka. This is pleasing. We have finally managed to join in such energetic activity ourselves, and to help politicize the broad masses. This is gratifying. At the same time, it is of course sad that so far the practical results of perestroyka are far from what we would like them to be, from what we expected. Quite a few difficulties and problems have emerged along the path of perestroyka, and they were very hard to foresee. We are striving to renew our society, but society's renewal is by no means a simple matter. Some people "renew" themselves (and I do mean this word to be within quotation marks) in order to solve the questions of their own prosperity or the prosperity of a certain group of persons, while others really undergo a cleansing process and strive to promote the perestroyka process.

People perceive these things differently. Whereas, on the whole, we believe that perestroyka does enjoy the people's support, we do encounter both positive and negative phenomena in its specific implementation at all levels, in all echelons of power. There are those who strive to act more swiftly, in a more radical and more revolutionary fashion, maybe even to leap over some stages—this won't do. There are those who strive to stand still, to wait and see in the belief that everything should take shape of its own accord. Both actually exist. And one of our main tasks is to find the best possible option for vital decisions here.

[Terekhov] A draft Law on the Election of RSFSR People's Deputies has been published in the republic. It had the effect of a bombshell on many people—Russia has gone further than the Union Law on Elections, public organizations have not been given the right to conduct autonomous elections of people's deputies. Nobody expected such a turnabout. Tell us, please, how did the idea of such a radical turnabout originated?

[Vorotnikov] Of course, neither the Supreme Soviet nor the local soviets found it easy to move toward a final solution of the entire package of problems associated with preparing the drafts of the Law on Amendments and Amplifications to the Constitution and the Law on Elections. There were numerous fights, as it were, numerous arguments. But the main point was that we felt that there were shortcomings and miscalculations in the elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the amendments to the constitution.

We also wanted to find out: What is the opinion of people from various strata in our society? What, in their view, ought to be done to ensure that our laws conform as far as possible with society's interests, that they are in harmony with the times and enjoy people's support?

We did a great lot of work: We sent drafts to local organs and had them discussed in oblasts, krays, and autonomous formations. Initially, there were doubts: Should there be a two-chamber system. This is a far from simple question when it comes to Russia. Let us assume that, for the union, the creation of a two-chamber system is already a past stage and, moreover, these two chambers cover the entire territory of the Soviet Union since they are based on union republics.

In our republic, however, autonomous formations occupy only part of Russia. And only 18 percent of the population inhabits autonomous territories. Therefore, initially we said: Come on now, how can we suggest creating a Soviet of Nationalities for only 18 percent of the population? This would mean that, proportionately speaking, the Soviet of Nationalities would constitute just one-fifth of the soviet of the republic. And how do we find a form to ensure adherence to all proportions, to ensure that the Soviet of Nationalities would not comprise a majority of Russians or just persons of another nationality?

And so, we found a solution which adheres to all proportions, both in nominations to the congress and in the formation of chambers. National-territorial okrugs will be created so that every autonomous republic, regardless of population numbers, will have four autonomous okrugs. And there will be a representative of every autonomous formation in the chamber: From autonomous republics, from autonomous oblasts, from autonomous okrugs, from every territorial region of the okrugs, from every oblast and kray. And the proportions will be equal....

[Terekhov] Why was it decided to do away with elections in public organizations?

[Vorotnikov] We did indeed decide that we had to reject the preferential conditions provided by elections of deputies by public organizations. It is very difficult for us to bring out candidates from the party, the Academy of Sciences.... And many organizations are not in fact public. In addition, of course, it is not right when public organization deputies are in fact elected not by the organization itself but only by a narrow section of its members—a plenum or, at best, a conference. We reached this conclusion: Public organizations have the right to nominate. But to elect? Kindly compete in the okrug, be it territorial or national-territorial, with other candidate deputies who have been nominated by an enterprise, a collective farm, or at their place of residence, or have even nominated themselves. Kindly compete on an equal footing, democratically.

[Terekhov] Were some people not displeased?

[Vorotnikov] I would not say so. Individual comrades expressed doubts about the correctness of this decision. But they were individuals. We asked the country's Supreme Soviet to take our stance into account in union legislative acts.

To continue. We rejected okrug election campaign meetings. They will be convened in places where there are more than 10 candidates. We believe that voters should not be placed in a position of having to choose one candidate out of 40: It is hard to figure out who is who. At the same time, however, we ruled that there must be at least two candidates.

Another innovation. We believe that if a voter finds it hard to pick just one candidate and leaves two or three names on the list, his ballot paper should be declared valid. Each one gets his vote. Such ballot papers were previously declared invalid.

To continue. During the last elections, if candidate deputies were rejected in one okrug they moved on to another. Or moved from one public organization to another, even crossing from one republic to another for the sake of getting elected as deputies. This, in my view, cannot be classed as highly moral. And we have also laid down this consideration in the draft....

Of course, all this is still only in draft form. We are now receiving proposals, considering them, and classifying them. We will then discuss them and submit them to the Supreme Soviet session which will ultimately adopt the law.

And if, as you have said, these drafts have shocked some people—with a curative effect, I hope—I am pleased to hear it.

[Terekhov] Prior to these drafts, Russia was often accused of conservatism. Have you not heard these charges?

[Vorotnikov] Yes, I also have been accused of conservatism. This is what I have to say in this regard—of course, life is teaching us all the time. And now we realize that the more openness there is, the more democratism and the more mutual enrichment with ideas will there be. People can speak out, and we can better understand and share their concerns. After all, each one of us party and soviet officials ultimately wants to ensure that the beloved people and country lead a better life.

Of course, we also have quite a few people who place strictly departmental, parochial, and even sundry clubby interests above the interests of the state and the people. Their stance is: As long as everything will be fine for me. Take the following aspect for example: The economic reform offers an opportunity—given a conscious and conscientious attitude toward work—to gain considerable advantages for the collective, for the enterprise, for the sector, and for the state; but practice shows that group and selfish interests are prevalent in many collectives. Wages are rising due to sundry tricks which make it possible to receive money which has not been fully earned, by raising prices for examples. It thus becomes necessary to introduce amendments. And the clarifications adopted by the Supreme Soviet in connection with the Law on the State Enterprise offer an opportunity to slow down the inflationary process somewhat. Take the taxation of the wages fund. You know that it was perceived in many places as a brake on wage increases. Not by rank and file workers, not by mid-level personnel, but by leaders of the largest enterprises who believe that the state can be milked like a cow. And they were not worried in the least by the fact that there were no goods, that there was no real backing for the money.

[Terekhov] In their speeches at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and at the Supreme Soviet session, some deputies expressed regret that that RSFSR does not have its own party organization, its own Central Committee, and a series of institutions of power existing in other republics. How do you perceive this? And what is your attitude toward the republic's transition to economic accountability and economic independence [nezavisimost]?

[Vorotnikov] I believe that some speeches and published items on this subject display a lack of understanding of the real situation. Or ignorance of what is being done by Russia's Government and Supreme Soviet. The point is that questions associated with the expansion of our republic's sovereign rights and the creation of a whole series of structures which we lack is a long-standing issue. It has been discussed on numerous occasions. In any case, I recall that we have repeatedly raised these questions since 1975. But we were always told: Why be in hurry, why does Russia need all this? Russia was usually identified with the Soviet Union and was seen as some sort of shock absorber for all the processes occurring within the country. And if there were negative processes building up in the country, Russia was the first to be reproached, as if it were to be blamed for all that went wrong.

Let me repeat, the political structure question, the question of management structure and public organizations in general, was repeatedly discussed. Repeatedly. This also applies to regional economic accountability.

It was at least 3-4 years ago that we started tackling regional economic accountability, analyzing and building approaches toward it, and even experimenting with it on a trial basis. All this can be seen if you look at all our decisions and documents. Unfortunately, many comrades in the scientific sphere are unwilling to perceive and recognize this. But we did act. Specifically, we decided to introduce economic accountability in three of

Russia's regions for the time being—in the Tatar Autonomous Republic, in Sverdlovsk Oblast, and in Moscow.

It proved exceptionally complex to build models. The point is that our oblasts are dissimilar. We have a group of oblasts where, say, either industry or agriculture is developed more than the other. On the other hand, look at our northern regions which exist on subsidies to all intents and purposes. Each one of them had to build its own model. Building a model for Sverdlovsk Oblast, for example, is three times as complex as for Estonia. This is what must be realized. But the model has been built. Proposals have been worked out and submitted. We think that, starting in 1990, we will be able to effect a transition to regional economic accountability in these regions. Even though matters are moving with difficulty as regards Moscow.

We have officially submitted to the Central Committee and the government documents which explain our perception of the problem of expanding Russia's sovereign rights in the political sphere, the social sphere, and the economic sphere.

[Terekhov] Will there be a Russian Communist Party?

[Vorotnikov] We have no intention of forming a Russian Communist Party separate from the CPSU. But Russia's Communists must be given the opportunity to discuss and resolve their own questions by, for example, holding regular Russian conferences. We feel that it is necessary for this conference to elect or confirm a party Central Committee bureau for Russian questions.

As far as the apparatus is concerned, practice has shown that actions by parallel Central Committee apparatuses for Russia and for the union cause only misunderstandings, conflicts, and even confrontation at times. We therefore think of relying on a single apparatus.

There could be similar development of other public organizations.

We believe that ultimately we must tighten up the entire law enforcement system which is now fragmented in our republic. We have a Russian prosecutor's office, we have Russian courts, [Ministry of] Justice, Board of Arbitration, but we do not have a Russian MVD. We have repeatedly proposed a solution to this question. But now this problem has got us, as people say, by the throat and we need our own MVD, this is absolutely necessary. It is also necessary in the country's interests....

I would like to turn back to economic accountability once more. We cannot transfer 71 oblasts, Moscow, and Leningrad to economic accountability simultaneously. This is a pipe dream. I don't know of a single clever person in the union who could say that Russia could introduce economic accountability any quicker. This would either indicate a lack of comprehension, or would be an attempt to present the Russian organization and the Russian leadership as conservative and unwilling to tackle questions of economic accountability. But this is not true. It is totally unrealistic to transfer the entire federation to economic accountability by 1991. But we will take this path. Leningrad is now getting ready, in addition to three autonomous republics, Moscow, and Sverdlovsk Oblast. Very active work along this avenue is being done also in Kemerovo, Tomsk, Stavropol, Kuybyshev, and a whole series of other regions. As they become ready, we will transfer them to economic accountability.

Another problem emerges. It was difficult, for example, to talk to miners when they kept asking why they were not being transferred to economic accountability, why they were being deprived of autonomy. The issue comes up against wholesale prices. We are in a state of total imbalance. This is why we must first bring wholesale prices in line, yes, wholesale rather than retail prices.... I said this also at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. But all this is somehow overlooked by those who criticize Russia. I don't wish to defend myself. Maybe there is a lot we have not worked out completely. Maybe we are lagging behind in some regards. Maybe we are insufficiently active in involving people. It is also true, however, that this work has been going on for a long time in Russia, just as it is true that there are complications, and further advance is difficult unless they are resolved. It is necessary to introduce order in the entire credit and finance system. And this must be done in the country as a whole, not just in Russia. If we do this only in Russia, we would place many republics in the most difficult position.

Some economist spoke at the Supreme Soviet session, I can't quite recall who, but I think he was from Lithuania. He said: Come on now, if you intend to sell oil, gas, and other raw materials at world prices, we shall not buy them but shall either ride bicycles or walk.

These are nothing but fancy words. In actual fact, you can't get anywhere without raw materials. You must have them. And the bulk of raw material resources are here, in Russia.

[Terekhov] Some people express fear that the concept of economic accountability is based on maintaining the current prices for raw materials, and then the economically accountable republics with processing industries will earn higher revenues than those selling raw materials.

[Vorotnikov] But this is unfair. This is unfair from economic, scientific, moral, and other positions. It is wrong to take advantage of current anomalies and use them as a basis to gain unearned benefits, in other words proceeding only from the premise that you would be manufacturing finished products.

It is not just a matter of raw materials. It is also a matter of many other materials. This means metal, as well as the elementary base of radio engineering and various electronic systems. Basically, all this also originates here.

[Terekhov] Russian enterprises account for 80 percent of foreign currency revenues. Is this so?

[Vorotnikov] Yes, it is.

[Terekhov] Then other republics will be on a starvation diet in terms of foreign currency.

[Vorotnikov] It would appear so. But the current situation is the exact opposite. Some republics, disregarding the financial situation, conclude contracts and set their own volumes of foreign currency deals, and then apply to the Bank for Foreign Trade [Vneshtorgbank] and submit the accounts for payment. If we all were to take this path now, the country would end up altogether ruined. We will sink even deeper into debt.

No, it is impossible to single out individual regions and create some kind of preferential conditions for them. But, for all intents and purposes, such conditions are already in existence. Even for our oblasts and krays which will be the first to switch to economic accountability. We are creating various conditions for them, which would enable them to balance their economies and to live on the basis of self-financing and self-sufficiency. In order to achieve this, we have to balance their books. It is just as well that these actual oblasts supplement our national income rather than drawing on it.

[Terekhov] A few words on the nationalities question and about the CPSU platform. Russia is the country's largest republic, there are more peoples living here than anywhere else, and yet there is nothing to be heard about any interethnic quarrels....

[Vorotnikov] There are problems, of course, and the public is familiar with them. They may not take as acute a form as in other regions. But the problems do exist, of course. First, problems associated with Soviet Germans. This is a Russian problem. And with Crimean Tatars. They are both a Russian and a Ukrainian problem. We are also facing questions emerging in the Northern Caucasus. Associated with, for example, the population in Checheno-Ingushetia. Take the peoples of the north for example. I especially looked into this question while in Magadan. Nationality problems are emerging virtually everywhere—in our larger autonomous republics, oblasts, and autonomous okrugs.

Now, in our practical work, we are finding ways to ensure that these problems do not spill over beyond the framework of the law. They should be promptly examined and resolved. In the north, for example, we face this question: The immigrant population is beginning to squeeze out residents of the tundra, Chukotka, Koryak Okrug, and elsewhere. They are being squeezed out of the locations of their ancestral occupations, out of their rightful territories where they engage in hunting, fishing, and deer breeding. Special activeness is displayed by individual categories of people whose interest is not in these occupations as such. They strive to bypass state channels in marketing their yields and thus earn additional income. They are active, persistent, and aggressive. Members of the local population are more modest. They live according to traditions. This activity by immigrants offends them. This is especially felt among the indigenous intelligentsia. We are thinking of elaborating a series of programs which would make it possible to create modern living conditions while preserving the traditional occupations typical of various regions.

Take deer breeding for example. This really means life on the move. Tents made of hide, herd driving, deer pastures. Here today, gone tomorrow. A nomadic life. Children have to get accustomed to such living conditions. There is also the nutrition problem, the health care problem—all this turns into demographic problems.

We have plenty of questions.... Questions of interethnic relations within Russia's framework will certainly be raised at the Central Committee plenum, and it is necessary to work out their long-term solutions.

[Terekhov] Tell us, please, how was the CPSU platform for the solution of the nationalities questions created, and do you agree with all its provisions? Is this platform a compromise solution which suits all republics and the "top," or does it contain only the center's proposals?

[Vorotnikov] I think that the CPSU platform must be perceived as a general political directive which should be developed at the plenum. It is important to receive in the first place principled evaluations of the main political provisions which describe interethnic relations in our country, as well as proposals and wishes, and only then to convene a plenum and conduct a discussion which could define our party's and our state's future path and policy on the questions of developing Lenin's nationalities policy in today's specific conditions, in the conditions of building the socialist society.

[Terekhov] Do you have any proposals of your own which could take this platform any further?

[Vorotnikov] There are proposals, but I did participate in the platform's formulation and therefore the basic principles underlying it coincide with my own stance.

[Terekhov] Did the entire party leadership agree with this platform?

[Vorotnikov] Yes. This was a united stance. But it did not emerge all at once. This is not the first version. There were discussions, amplifications of various provisions in the platform. We, myself and Comrade A.V. Vlasov in particular, jointly submitted proposals on a whole series of questions. Our remarks were taken into account.

But I cannot say that the draft platform gives an exhaustive answer to all questions. As a matter of fact, this was not the set goal. It is, after all, a basic political directive. Now we must develop it further and, of course, as applicable to each republic.

[Terekhov] Tell us about the role you play in the Politburo: Are you Russia's leader or simply a political figure?

[Vorotnikov] It is hard to draw a dividing line. In any case, I never let Russia's interest slip out of my field of vision. At the same time, however, I strive to look at these interests from statewide positions. It is not up to me to judge how successful I am in this. Not only I, but also all Politburo members, proceed from the premise that we must place the interests of the party and the interests of state above all else. At the same time, I of course cannot evade the responsibility I bear for the Russian Federation. Maybe at times the stance I take smacks of bias toward the republic. This is wrong, of course. I must have a better knowledge of the situation in Russia.

The Politburo is very actively at work. Every Politburo member can express his point of view on any question under discussion at a sitting. This is followed by arrival at decisions which would satisfy everyone.... We do not sit for just 40 minutes, as it used to be in the past. I was on the Politburo when it was chaired by L.I. Brezhnev, then by Yu.V. Andropov, and K.U. Chernenko, and now when it is chaired by M.S. Gorbachev. I must say that the Politburo's work now is, of course, very intense and active.

[Terekhov] Is there continuity between the work of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo under Andropov and now?

[Vorotnikov] I think so. First, this is indicated by a principled approach toward questions under discussion. This is the most important point. Principled. Not personal, not a private stance or the stance of, say, the apparatus or some group of people. The Politburo's work is distinguished by concern for statewide interests.

[Terekhov] A question in which many people are interested: What is your attitude toward informal Russian associations like the "Pamyat" Society, the "Russian People's Front," and others?

[Vorotnikov] Generally speaking, I take a different attitude toward people's fronts and informal associations. It is not simple to define. On the whole, I believe that the creation of social formations or informal organizations is, on the whole, a positive phenomenon. But they differ in their orientation, in their composition, in their positions. Therefore, the attitude toward them, of course, differs.

In the Russian Federation we have approximately 40 oblasts, krays, and autonomous formations with their own regional people's fronts. There are formations which actually work for perestroyka and cooperate with soviet organs and other public organizations. Of course, my attitude toward them is positive.

There are also some which adhere to extreme positions, be they left-wing or right-wing. This is why you need a selective approach toward them. They are right in some respects. There are, however, organizations which are altogether unacceptable in terms of their nature, their programs, and their ideas. They have an obviously antisocialist nature. A major role in them is played by extremist elements which sidetrack them away from perestroyka and democratization.

[Terekhov] Many thanks. I realize that I took much more of your time than you could spare.

[Vorotnikov] I am prepared to answer questions. You must realize, of course, that this was an impromptu conversation.

[Terekhov] And all the better for it.

[Vorotnikov] But in an impromptu conversation one does not always find the precise words and could err on the side of verbosity.... I ask to be forgiven.

Tyumen Oilmen Urge Yeltsin To Save Pipeline

PM0809154189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Yuriy Perepletkin reports from Tyumen Oblast: "Conflict in the Polar Region"]

[Text] The slogans ran: "The fate of those who have been sacked or made redundant is yours tomorrow!" and "Down with the tour-of-duty method!" With these slogans members of an action group set up in the "Severtruboprovodstroy" trust came to the central square in Nadym in order to collect signatures to an open letter to B. Yeltsin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Construction and Architecture Questions. Three days earlier an SOS cable was dispatched to the USSR Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises, addressed to Minister V. Chirskov.

What has happened in the polar region around Tyumen? Drastic cuts in the investments for the development of the West Siberian fuel and energy complex have hit the interests of construction workers first and foremost. The ministry's leading trust has suffered especially.

The drop that made the cup overflow was the latest piece of news from the capital: Under the sector's plans for the coming year the trust will lose R170 million in one fell swoop, since the ministry has decided to stop funding the construction of the gas pipeline from the north to the Urals.

It has to be borne in mind that over the past 3 years the allocation of funds for construction and installation work has been cut from R385 million to R50 million. With great difficulty it proved possible to reduce staffing at the trust by 50 percent. And suddenly this latest surprise from the ministry. It means that at least 2,500 highly skilled workers, engineers, and technicians will be deprived of all prospects.

I asked V. Tretyakov, IZVESTIYA's freelance correspondent in Nadym, to urgently get in touch with O.

Kodokolovich, leader of the action group, and find out his position. The representative of the northern construction workers said:

"The acute problems besetting the trust are problems which affect the whole city. Some 40,000 of Nadym's 57,000 inhabitants work in subdivisions of the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises. In the open letter which already bears 1,200 signatures the polar region specialists demand that the practice of "flying in" teams from central and southern parts of the country be stopped. At the moment more than 8,000 people are being flown in on Aeroflot flights from Moscow, Leningrad, Kuybyshev, Alma-Ata, Ryazan, and other cities. And the northeners who have put down roots in this inclement region and are raising their families here are now being deprived of their jobs and told to go and work in the Non-Chernozem Zone.

"The campaign participants believe that the construction of the gas pipeline from the north to the Urals should be continued. The estimated cost of the project is R390 million and the proposed moth-balling of the project will cost at least R320 million. Is it worth paying twice over for one and the same pipeline?

"A similar situation is taking shape also in other cities of the Tyumen region.

"The Nadym action group has joined up with neighboring groups and acquired the status of a regional organization. The word 'strike' is not yet being used openly but USSR People's Deputy V. Voskoboynikov has dispatched a cable to the country's Council of Ministers requesting that a government commission be set up to avert a conflict fraught with serious consequences from the outset."

[Question] "And the local authorities?"

"We cannot resolve the problem on our own," V. Rezvov, second secretary of the Nadym city party committee, said. "We have asked okrug and oblast organs and the Ministry of the Petroleum and Gas Industry and the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises for support. So far we have received no answers from anywhere...."

Kaliningrad Obkom Elects New First Secretary

LD0709230589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A plenum of the Kaliningrad Oblast Party Committee [obkom] which examined an organizational matter, has been held. The plenum relieved Comrade Romanin of the duties of first secretary of the oblast CPSU committee, in connection with his retirement on pension. Over 10 candidatures, which had been discussed in advance in rayon and town party organizations and at a session of the bureau of the oblast committee, were proposed for the post of first secretary of the oblast committee. The candidatures of comrade (Semenov), second secretary of the oblast committee, and Comrade Malinkin, chairman of the oblast executive committee, were entered on the list for a secret ballot at the oblast committee plenum. Comrade (Semenov) was elected first secretary of the Kaliningrad Oblast Party Committee by a majority of votes.

PRAVDA Views Peasants' Role in Perestroyka

PM1109125489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The Party and the Peasantry"]

[Text] Perhaps the main question that concerns everyone today is the food question. And this is no accident. People quite rightly judge the practical results of perestroyka in the countryside by the shelves in the food stores. There are not many changes there; although there has been an increase in output, it is clearly insufficient.

The peasant question has always been central to the party's policy. True, it was by no means always resolved fairly, and serious strategic errors were made. The use of coercive methods of collectivization, the imposition of the administrative edict system of management, the transformation of rural workers into hired laborers—all this did enormous damage to the country's agrarian sector. Today the reasons for the mistakes have been uncovered and guarantees are being created in society against similar social, economic, and moral defects occurring in the future.

The peasant is the true master of the land. That is the crux of the party's new agrarian policy. Many innovations of the recent past were unsuccessful precisely because they failed to reckon with the interests of the rural worker. For many years people were alienated from the means of production. And that largely determined their attitude to labor. The party has resolutely left behind the dogmas of the past, and at the CPSU Central Committee March (1989) Plenum it acknowledged the full equality of different forms of economic management. The peasant can choose where it is more convenient for him to apply his efforts—on a collective farm [kolkhoz], state farm [sovkhoz], or small cooperative, or on a personal plot or family farm. Although in practice not everyone is yet able to realize this opportunity. Letters to the editorial office ask, for instance: What if someone wants to leave a kolkhoz with a parcel of land?

Economic relations in the countryside have clearly fallen behind life's pressing needs. The party believes that without radical changes in this sphere it is useless to expect an improvement in food supplies. Neither the capital investments allocated, nor modern technology will produce marked results of their own accord, until the former economic mechanism, nurtured by the administrative and bureaucratic system, is done away with. That is why the cumbersome USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee has been abolished, all the main management components are being restructured, and their functions are being changed. However, agricultural combines, firms, and associations seem to have inherited all the worst features of the rayon agro-industrial associations. Economic methods of management are being assimilated extremely slowly.

Last year kolkhozes and sovkhozes made a profit of R44 billion, and the profitability of production was over 30 percent. But there are no grounds for complacency. There is still too much formalism, too much of a bureaucratic approach in the assimilation of economic accountability. Economic accountability is capable of operating not just on paper, but for real in lease collectives and cooperatives. But it is not always allowed to develop as necessary. Some zealous administrators try to clip the wings of initiative. Certain leaders only want an intra-farm lease system.

In strengthening the countryside's material base the state counts on a high return on the resources invested. The cost-based economy is still retarding the development of scientific and technical progress. The majority of machines are not up to the farmer's needs and aspirations. And in general the relationship between the city and the countryside is far from perfect. Thus during these harvest days combines and trucks often stand idle with empty tanks or with no batteries. Or because there is no replacement for a broken component. The peasant is still a supplicant, dependent on the supplier, repairer, and other partners.

Peasants learn with grief and anxiety how the produce they have grown with such difficulty is lost during storage and processing. Nearly 1 million tonnes of meat and about one-third of the vegetables and fruit fail to reach the stores. It is inconceivable to go on tolerating this. Therefore R77 billion has been allocated to the modernization of the food industry, and defense enterprises have been charged with producing modern equipment. And, particularly impportant—the processing base is being moved nearer to the fields and livestock units, directly onto the farms. True, the implementation of the planned changes in the food industry is not going as rapidly as one would wish. Last year one in every three of the planned projects failed to be commissioned. This year, too, in the first half-year, the target for assimilating investments at the most important food industry construction projects was not met.

The problem of social restructuring of the countryside remains acute. People are still leaving the villages. The party demands that we face up to the rural worker's needs. Work must be launched on a wide scale to supply gas, heat, and water and build roads and housing.

The party completely rejects strong-arm, pressure tactics. Administrative management practice has finally been discredited, although certain party committee secretaries keep issuing "directives" on who should begin field work and when. Today party organizations strive to act by means of skillful work with people. It is important to ensure that the peasants understand the need for change and to strengthen the confidence that the new agrarian policy is stable and long-term.

The accretions of the past cannot be discarded at a stroke. Perestroyka is a long and painful process. Orders from the bosses are emanating less and less often from the offices, and people are beginning to act increasingly confidently. They want to be the masters of their land, and to remain so forever.

Economic

Maslyukov on 1990 Plan To Improve Social Sphere

LD0909222989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1504 GMT 9 Sep 89

["Topical interview" with Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, Gosplan, by unidentified correspondent; date and place of interview not specified—recorded]

[Text] The plan for 1990 is a sort of watershed [rubezhnyy] plan because it was prepared and worked out in conditions of very great social tension which have arisen from the legitimate demands of the workers about the need to raise the standard of living. Perhaps the main thing is to implement structural perestoyka of our industry so that it should work more in the interests of the consumers, so that it should produce more consumer goods. In order to eliminate the [word indistinct] trend in our industry we have severly cut the capital investment directed at the productive sphere by almost R20 billion. Of course, this will slow down, somewhat, the growth in production rates in industry, but at the same time will create the essential conditions to increase development in the social sphere, especially in housing. While planning, we have always remembered that by the year 2000 each family must have either an individual apartment or an individual house. For that reason, we have planned for next year the building of 144 million square meters of housing. This is a growth of approximately 17 percent against the level of 1989. In so doing we have not forgotten about schools: There will be an increase of about 1.7 million students' places in schools. This, too, is significantly more than was planned before. We have not forgotten about hospitals, polyclinics, cultural establishments. The first question always began with asking how many consumer goods will be produced? This concerned both republics and ministries, and yet the average annual growth by republic and by ministry, and by our concerns, the increment of consumer goods, is more than 20 percent. This will give in total more than R40 billion of increment in 1 year. We have never had such rates before.

Will this correct the market? Yes, this will have a significant effect on the market, and the stabilization of the circulation of money. The resources for this plan, and for this restructuring of approach, can only be found in the national income, which we have to earn, and the rate of growth of the national income, and its absolute growth will enable us to seek out these resources. We have got behind us a high growth in labor productivity: According to our calculations we think it will be about 5 percent, and the sum total of these measures to increase labor productivity—that's to say, the increase in the volume of national income, and of course the most important thing, the increase in resources from savings; that's to say cuts in the amount of metal used; that's to say cuts in the energy use in the national income—that will enable us to create the essential resources to implement this policy.

Of course, we are slowing down the rates of growth of technical progress in these branches of industry. But at the same time this will enable us to accumulate a whole series of hi-tech technologies and solutions which will enable us to carry out reconstruction and expansion and technical reequipment of branches of industry more efficiently in the future. Because even when carrying out these actions, we have always remembered that machine-building will be the root of our technical reequipment and reconstruction. And we have managed to ensure a rate of growth in machine-building which outstrips that in other branches of industry. However, in this respect, the rates of growth for group B, as opposed to group A, were considerably higher than we planned at the start of the 5-year period. These rates exceed 10-fold what we intended doing.

[Correspondent] Speaking before the deputies at the session, you said, I recall, that the situation which had developed in the country's economy was extreme, and accordingly demanded of us extreme measures.

[Maslyukov] Extreme measures have to be taken in the economy; extreme measures in the economy applied to all articles of the budget, because one can, after all, only halve the deficit by means of out-of-the-ordinary efforts. There is a R6 Billion defense cut, a reduction in spending on the government apparatus, and measures to increase the efficiency, to reduce the amount of power consumed and the amount of materials consumed, of the national economy.

[Correspondent] I think it might be more correct to address the next question to the minister of finance, but nevertheless...what is planned to be done in order to reduce somewhat the budget deficit? How is that reflected in the plan?

[Maslyukov] This is reflected in the plan in the most specific way: Reductions in capital investment, reductions in military spending and government expenditure. This is cutting losses, cutting loss-making enterprises. It is introducing for the first time civilized measures for the mobilization of monetary resources generated by enterprises as the issue of state loans at an enhanced interest rate. This is also mobilization of the funds of the public and the issue of interest-free fixed term state loans for consumer goods, that is, an interest-free loan, and the consumer can, at a time agreed in advance, ahead of others, obtain some kind of durable item currently in short supply on our market—a motor vehicle, motorcycle, video recorder, or something else. There will be a list of such goods.

[Correspondent] You have said that targeted planning should be the most important aspect of the State Planning Committee's activities: Planning specific scientific-technological programs. Is this taken into account in drawing up the plan for 1990, and what specific programs are we talking about?

[Maslyukov] We are restructuring the work of the State Planning Committee precisely in favor of program-specific planning methods. That is, the goal comes first, and then a program is drawn up to achieve that goal. We have 14 specific scientific programs functioning in the country covering all fields of activity, from problems of horticulture, of foodstuffs, to problems of developing new-generation technology and of planning to supply consumer goods, to which we should pay sufficiently great attention. And, of course, there is a program for the development of fundamental science, fundamental research by the Academy of Sciences. This is also reflected. In addition, when planning for the industries and the national economic complexes, we have taken into account and have incorporated measures which will be the quickest and will yield the greatest results from the point of view of increasing the efficiency of public-sector production. So this part has also been reviewed in detail, I shall take acocunt of your question and I will be attempting to give a broader response to your question in my report to the session.

[Correspondent] The economic reform is gathering pace, the organizational structure of the economy is being restructured, and I see that this has, in general, been taken into account in the plan.

[Maslyukov] Yes.

[Correspondent] Specifically, regional and republican financial autonomy.

[Maslyukov] Absolutely. The first resolution on the transfer of a union republic to financial autonomy and self-recouping has been signed. This first republic is Belorussia. Firstly, the republic gains charge of the whole social sphere. It gets all production of consumer goods, like, say, light industry, and all construction matters. It gets a very large number of rights in respect of enterprises, because all enterprises formerly subordinate to a union-republican ministry transfer to republican control. And this creates a particular economic basis for shaping the budget of the republic, for enabling the republic independently to determine from which sources to make money and for what purposes to channel it. All the republics are different, and the republic gets actual independence, not apparent independence. We are continuing the debate, still, concerning the transfer of the Baltic republics; you know that this issue has been considered at the session of the Supreme Soviet. Here we have as yet been unable to achieve 100 percent mutual understanding; we have certain difficulties here.

[Correspondent] What is the main problem?

[Maslyukov] Of course, the main problem is the problem of property. That is the main problem because the union republics recognize only republican property; they reject all the other kinds of property. I mean the Baltic republics—it is not all of them. We proceed from the premise that facilities in the infrastructure belong to the whole state, and that facilities which operate on the basis of statewide production of labor should come under the jurisdiction of the center. We are as yet unable to reach agreement on this with certain republics, but we will continue working with them.

[Correspondent] It has become a sign of good taste to criticize the State Planning Committee. I think that very frequently and to a considerable extent this stems from the fact that we have a poor idea of the work of the State Planning Committee. Is restructuring taking place in the work of your department? How do you assess it and how is this being manifested specifically at the moment?

[Maslyukov] Well, as far as criticism of the State Planning Committee is concerned, it exists, and should do so. We are not working as well as we would like. So far our statistics and our information system have not yielded sufficient data for the people—even those with the relevant scientific training and training as economists—to be able to draw the correct conclusions. This is our fault, as much of the data was classified or somehow distorted. So a process is now under way whereby we are increasingly widely revealing the information and methods of working which we use. As for the restructuring of the style and method of our work, well, the new style of work of the Supreme Soviet after the congress, has, out of necessity, whether intentionally or not, so to say, created certain changes in the work of the State Planning Committee.

Today when we are working things out we now explain not only the final figure, but also explain the technology of our work. The very existence of a body of deputies and of standing commissions in itself changes somewhat both the style and quality and the standard of our work. In conditions of setting up a state based on law we need to create a legal basis for the functioning of the economy, for the functioning of industry and of agriculture, and here,too, we are engaged in working out very many different documents and draft laws. That is to say, our work is now becoming more creative.

Gossnab Official Explains Gasoline Shortages

PM0809154089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 2

["Biased Reportage" comprising reports from correspondents S. Bablumyan in Armenia; I. Litvinova in Latvia; and interview with V. Kostyunin, deputy chairman of USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, by correspondent V. Zaykin: "Why Has Gasoline Disappeared?"]

[Text] Urgent reports on the sudden disappearance of gasoline are coming in from many regions today. Numerous rumors are springing up. Our correspondents report the situation on the spot.

S. Bablumyan reports from Armenia:

In early August, an unaccustomed silence descended on the republic's freeways. The mass of cars that is usual at this time of year is not to be seen, and traffic in the city streets has also declined sharply. "No gas"—signs to that effect hang at the filling stations. The situation is indeed exceptional.

The main suppliers of Armenia's fuel are the enterprises and tank stations of Makhachkala, Volgograd, Orenburg, and Baku. As of today the republic is short of deliveries to the tune of 27,000 tonnes of gasoline and more than 6,000 tonnes of diesel fuel. Need it be said how severely this affects restoration work in the earthquake zone? Work schedules are disrupted, a significant proportion of equipment stands idle, the commissioning of priority projects is in jeopardy. In Spitak, for instance, Czechoslovak- and German-made buses, which run exclusively on AI-93-grade gasoline, have been banished to the parking lots. These vehicles delivered foreign specialists engaged in restoration operations to the construction sites. The situation is particularly grave in Stepanavan. Interruptions in the transport system have become chronic there.

I. Litvinova reports from Latvia:

A month ago long lines were forming at the gas stations from early morning. All kinds of speculation were rife in these tedious waiting lines.... Some said it was retaliation for the republic's desire for economic autonomy—Moscow is turning off the "faucet"....

Yet gasoline and diesel fuel are delivered to the republic from Lithuania—from the Mazheykyay petroleum refinery. In the 1st half-year alone, there was a shortfall of 44,000 tonnes of gasoline in deliveries from there.

In principle, it was only by the efforts of the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply [Gossnab] that the situation with fuel supplies to Latvia was normalized.

But what happened in Mazheykyay? Why did the local petroleum refinery fail to supply its neighboring republic with the planned quantity of gasoline and diesel fuel?

At the Baltic Railroad Administration I was told that because of poorly tuned production lines the refinery is underproducing so-called "blue fuel" (which goes into gasoline) and overproducing fuel oil [mazut], which the railroad is forced to export using above plan. In August alone, for instance, tens of thousands of tonnes of above-plan fuel oil were dispatched from the refinery.

The Lithuanian Council of Ministers sent the Mazheykyay refinery instructions to reduce primary oil refining by 1 million tonnes and limit the capacity of the third phase (catalytic cracking) to 50 percent. The explanation: The refinery has a harmful effect on the environment. The refinery's labor collective, as chief engineer A. Gimbutas explained, agreed to the first proposal. They decided to reduce the capacity of the third phase to 75 percent. [Litvinova ends]

Whereas in the Baltic region the fuel situation has returned to normal on the whole, in many other regions it remains critical. Our correspondents from Georgia, the Ukraine, Checheno-Ingushetia, and Rostov and Pavlodar Oblasts report huge lines at gas stations.

At the request of IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Zaykin, V. Kostyunin, deputy chairman of the USSR Gossnab, comments on the situation:

[Kostyunin] The volume of petroleum products produced in the country is stable. Demand is increasing every year, however. We have not learned to economize. But it is time we did! In some places they do not know how to manage resources effectively.

Transport uses a vast quantity of gasoline. The switching of motor vehicles to diesel and gas fuel is proceeding very slowly.

Production discipline has recently declined sharply in petroleum refining sectors, and among railmen and fuel consumers. Hence the problems.

The thoroughness of petroleum refining at our refineries averages 61 percent. We receive little of the light petroleum products (gasoline, diesel fuel) and a great deal of fuel oil. In the developed capitalist countries the thoroughness of refining is around 85 percent.

Enterprises' economic autonomy sometimes takes an unexpected turn. Some people feel they have the right to reduce the volume of contract deliveries. And fuel is stored, with the full volume of petroleum products being dispatched only to consumers in one's own region. Yet as the central organ we no longer have the right to intervene and dictate terms: To whom supplies should be sent, in what quantities. As a result Russia supplies too little gasoline and diesel fuel to the Ukraine, Lithuania to Latvia....

[Zaykin] And why are consumers in Georgia and Armenia suffering?

[Kostyunin] Here the blame lies with the well-known events in Abkhazia. The North Caucasus Railroad is overburdened with freight. There are holdups everywhere. Because of violations of technological discipline, the "Azneftekhim" Association produces extremely small quantitites of light petroleum products. That is exacerbating the situation. We are looking for potential in order to supply these republics with as much fuel as possible. In September their needs will be fully satisfied. We will also make good the August shortfalls.

[Zaykin] Why is Lithuania not fulfilling its commitments and disrupting fuel deliveries?

[Kostyunin] Under its contracts, Lithuania should supply petroleum products to Latvia, Estonia, and Kaliningrad Oblast. On this basis the Mazheykyay refinery is supplied with petroleum. There is one plant for the whole region, and it must be brought up to design capacity. Yet the commissioning of the third phase is dragging on too long. Because of this alone, in August consumers failed to receive tens of thousands of tonnes of gasoline and diesel fuel. I cannot understand, incidentally, why questions connected with the enterprise's effect on the environment are arising now. The project was agreed beforehand with the republic. If there are shortcomings, we will eliminate them! But why reduce volumes?

In general, the country does not have so very many oil refineries. And they are extremely unevenly distributed over the country's territory. Fuel has to be shipped over vast distances.

[Zaykin] And how do things stand with shipments?

[Kostyunin] The situation is absolutely intolerable. In August alone, for instance, more than 2 million tonnes of petroleum products were not transported. The Ministry of Railways is working far worse than last year.

In general, there are a great many problems. Furthermore it is the busy time, the harvest...

We are looking for a solution. I think it is a question of time.

From the Editorial Office: We do not doubt it. The only question is: How much time?

Agricultural

Belousov Notes New State Agrochemical Association

LD0909171189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1400 GMT 9 Sep 89

[Text] Voskresensk, 9 Sep (TASS)—A constituent conference, which adopted a decision about the creation of a State Agro-Chemical Association (Agrokhim) and which elected the leading bodies of that new organization, took place in this city in Moscow Oblast today.

Addressing the participants in the meeting, Igor Belousov, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman, emphasized the important significance of successful activity of Agrokhim enterprises for the purpose of assistance in the provision of foodstuffs to the population. He set Agrokhim the task of increasing the quality and increasing the output of mineral fertilizers, which is insufficient for the agrochemical complex of the country, to accelerate the rate of growth in yield agricultural crop levels.

The meeting was addressed by Nikolay Olshanskiy, elected chairman of Agrokhim, who defined the main directions for bringing the agro-chemical enterprises of the country out onto a fundamentally new level.

Farm Experiment To Determine Future Grain Imports

LD1109091689 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 11 Sep 89

[Text] The Soviet Union has completed in the main this year's purchases of grain abroad. This was announced by Oleg Klimov, who heads the Eksportkleb Foreign Trade Association. He said the USSR Supreme Soviet hasn't yet discussed the new plan of importing grain in 1990 but most probably, he added, purchases will be reduced. The Soviet Union is conducting an experiment this and next year—convertible currencies paid to the farm co-operatives and government-owned farms for above-plan grain purchases. Oleg Klimov added that the results of the experiment will determine the size of grain import in the future.

Agricultural Developments for 7-9 Sep Reported

LD1109025289

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 7 - 9 September, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, and in parentheses, are at the end of each item.

7 September

To date, kolkhozes (collective farms) and sovkhozes (state farms) in Altay Kray have sold the first million tonnes of grain to the state. (0900)

Agricultural workers in Lipetsk Oblast have completed the cereal harvest. A total of 650,000 tonnes has been sent to grain receiving enterprises, more than envisaged by the plan. (0900)

The 2-millionth tonne of grain is being harvested in Orenburg Oblast, and deliveries of first-class wheat are growing. The harvest of groat crops is quite good. (1100)

Tselinograd Oblast has provided 1 million of the 3 million tonnes of wheat submitted to the state by Kazakhstan from the new harvest. (1830)

8 September

Harvesting is being carried out on the 20 millionth hectare in Kazakhstan. Four-fifths of the grain area has been threshed. (0900)

The first thousands of tonnes of above-plan grain have arrived at the elevators and reception points of Amur Oblast. Buckwheat threshing is underway and preparations are also being made for reaping on the soya fields. (1100)

The first sugar from the new sugar beet harvest has been produced in the Orlov Oblast, where the season began 2 weeks early due to the early harvest. (1300)

Extreme heat has prevented the planned amount of grain from being harvested in Orenburg Oblast, and incremental payment for high-quality grain is R500,000. (1300)

9 September

The grain-growers of Voronezh Oblast have completed the grain harvest and have obtained 27 quintals per hectare, a very big yield, in the oblast as a whole, and have sold 1.3 million tonnes of grain to the state. (Moscow Television Service in Russian 0230)